

LOCALIZED FACTORIZATIONS OF INTEGERS

DIMITRIS KOUKOULOPOULOS

ABSTRACT. We determine the order of magnitude of $H^{(k+1)}(x, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y})$, the number of integers $n \leq x$ that are divisible by a product $d_1 \cdots d_k$ with $y_i < d_i \leq 2y_i$, when the numbers $\log y_1, \dots, \log y_k$ have the same order of magnitude and $k \geq 2$. This generalizes a result by Kevin Ford when $k = 1$. As a corollary of these bounds, we determine the number of elements up to multiplicative constants that appear in a $(k+1)$ -dimensional multiplication table as well as how many distinct sums of $k+1$ Farey fractions there are modulo 1.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let k be a fixed positive integer. Take all numbers up to N and form all possible products $n_1 \cdots n_{k+1}$ with $n_i \leq N$ for all i . Obviously, there will be many numbers that appear numerous times in this $(k+1)$ -dimensional multiplication table. A natural question arising is how many distinct integers there are in the table. This question was first posed by Erdős (see [2] and [3]) when $k = 1$. Motivated by this problem we define

$$A_{k+1}(N) = |\{n_1 \cdots n_{k+1} : n_i \leq N \ (1 \leq i \leq k+1)\}|.$$

The key to understanding the combinatorics of A_{k+1} is the counting function of localized factorizations

$$H^{(k+1)}(x, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) := |\{n \leq x : \tau_{k+1}(n, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \geq 1\}|,$$

where

$$\tau_{k+1}(n, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) := |\{(d_1, \dots, d_k) : d_1 \cdots d_k | n, \ y_i < d_i \leq z_i \ (1 \leq i \leq k)\}|$$

and $\mathbf{y}$ and $\mathbf{z}$ are k -dimensional vectors. The transition from $H^{(k+1)}$ to A_{k+1} is achieved via the elementary inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} (1.1) \quad & H^{(k+1)}\left(\frac{N^{k+1}}{2^k}, \left(\frac{N}{2}, \dots, \frac{N}{2}\right), (N, \dots, N)\right) \leq A_{k+1}(N) \\ & \leq \sum_{\substack{1 \leq 2^{m_i} \leq N \\ 1 \leq i \leq k}} H^{(k+1)}\left(\frac{N^{k+1}}{2^{m_1 + \dots + m_k}}, \left(\frac{N}{2^{m_1+1}}, \dots, \frac{N}{2^{m_{k+1}+1}}\right), \left(\frac{N}{2^{m_1}}, \dots, \frac{N}{2^{m_k}}\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

When $k = 1$, Ford [6], improving upon estimates of Tenenbaum [12], showed that

$$H^{(2)}(x, y, 2y) \asymp \frac{x}{(\log y)^{Q(\frac{1}{\log 2})} (\log \log y)^{3/2}} \quad (3 \leq y \leq \sqrt{x}),$$

Date: May 18, 2010.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 11N25.

where

$$Q(u) := \int_1^u \log t \, dt = u \log u - u + 1 \quad (u > 0).$$

As a consequence, he proved that

$$A_2(N) \asymp \frac{N^2}{(\log N)^{Q(\frac{1}{\log 2})} (\log \log N)^{3/2}} \quad (N \geq 3).$$

In the present paper we generalize this result by Ford to the function $H^{(k+1)}$. Set $\rho = (k+1)^{1/k}$. Then we prove the following theorem which gives the order of magnitude of $H^{(k+1)}(x, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y})$ when all the numbers $\log y_1, \dots, \log y_k$ have the same order of magnitude. This suffices for the application to A_{k+1} .

Theorem 1. *Let $k \geq 2$ and $0 < \delta \leq 1$. Consider $x \geq 1$ and $3 \leq y_1 \leq y_2 \leq \dots \leq y_k$ with $2^{k+1}y_1 \dots y_k \leq x/y_1^\delta$. Then*

$$H^{(k+1)}(x, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y}) \ll_{k,\delta} \left(\frac{\log y_k}{\log y_1} \right)^{k+1} \frac{x}{(\log y_1)^{Q(\frac{1}{\log \rho})} (\log \log y_1)^{3/2}}.$$

Furthermore, if we assume that $y_k \leq y_1^c$ for some $c \geq 1$, then

$$H^{(k+1)}(x, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y}) \gg_{k,\delta,c} \frac{x}{(\log y_1)^{Q(\frac{1}{\log \rho})} (\log \log y_1)^{3/2}},$$

and consequently

$$H^{(k+1)}(x, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y}) \asymp_{k,\delta,c} \frac{x}{(\log y_1)^{Q(\frac{1}{\log \rho})} (\log \log y_1)^{3/2}}.$$

As a corollary we obtain the order of magnitude of A_{k+1} for every fixed $k \geq 2$.

Corollary 1. *Let $k \geq 2$. For every $N \geq 3$ we have that*

$$A_{k+1}(N) \asymp_k \frac{N^{k+1}}{(\log N)^{Q(\frac{1}{\log \rho})} (\log \log N)^{3/2}}.$$

Proof. Apply Theorem 1 to the left inequality of (1.1) to obtain the lower bound. For the upper bound apply Theorem 1 to the right inequality of (1.1) if $2^{m_i+1} \leq \sqrt{N}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$. Note that in this case $\frac{N}{2^{m_i+1}} \leq \left(\frac{N}{2^{m_j+1}}\right)^2$ for all i and j in $\{1, \dots, k\}$. Else, use the trivial bound $H^{(k+1)}(x, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y}) \leq x$. $\square$

Another application. In [11] Haynes and Homma study the set

$$F_R(k+1) := \left\{ \frac{b_1}{r_1} + \dots + \frac{b_{k+1}}{r_{k+1}} \pmod{1} : 1 \leq b_i \leq r_i \leq R, (b_i, r_i) = 1 \ (1 \leq i \leq k+1) \right\},$$

namely the set of distinct sums modulo 1 of $k+1$ Farey fractions of order R . They show that

$$|F_R(2)| \asymp \frac{R^4}{(\log R)^{Q(\frac{1}{\log 2})} (\log \log R)^{3/2}}.$$

To estimate $|F_R(k+1)|$ for an arbitrary k we need the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *Let $k \geq 1$, $0 < \delta \leq 1$ and $c \geq 1$. Consider $x \geq 1$ and $3 \leq y_1 \leq y_2 \leq \dots \leq y_k$ with $2^{k+1}y_1 \dots y_k \leq x/y_1^\delta$ and $y_k \leq y_1^c$. Then*

$$\tilde{H}^{(k+1)}(x, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y}) := \sum_{\substack{x/2 < n \leq x, \mu^2(n)=1 \\ \tau_{k+1}(n, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y}) \geq 1}} \frac{\phi(n)}{n} \gg_{k, \delta, c} \frac{x}{(\log y_1)^{Q(\frac{1}{\log \rho})} (\log \log y_1)^{3/2}}.$$

Observe that the above theorem is stronger than the lower bound in Theorem 1. As a corollary we obtain the order of magnitude of the cardinality of $F_R(k+1)$ for every fixed $k \geq 2$.

Corollary 2. *Let $k \geq 2$. For every $R \geq 3$ we have that*

$$|F_R(k+1)| \asymp_k \frac{R^{2k+2}}{(\log R)^{Q(\frac{1}{\log \rho})} (\log \log R)^{3/2}}.$$

Proof. In Corollary 2 in [11] it was shown that

$$F_R(k+1) = \left\{ \frac{b}{r} : 1 \leq b \leq r, (b, r) = 1, r = r_1 \dots r_{k+1}, \right. \\ \left. r_i \leq R (1 \leq i \leq k+1), (r_i, r_j) = 1 (1 \leq i < j \leq k+1) \right\}.$$

Therefore if we set

$$\mathcal{A}_{k+1}(N) = \{n_1 \dots n_{k+1} : n_i \leq N (1 \leq i \leq k+1)\}$$

so that $A_{k+1}(N) = |\mathcal{A}_{k+1}(N)|$, then

$$(1.2) \quad |F_R(k+1)| \leq \sum_{r \in \mathcal{A}_{k+1}(R)} \phi(r) \leq R^{k+1} A_{k+1}(R) \ll_k \frac{R^{2k+2}}{(\log R)^{Q(\frac{1}{\log \rho})} (\log \log R)^{3/2}},$$

by Corollary 1. Moreover,

$$(1.3) \quad |F_R(k+1)| \geq \sum_{\substack{r \in \mathcal{A}_{k+1}(R) \\ \frac{R^{k+1}}{2^{k+1}} < r \leq \frac{R^{k+1}}{2^k}, \mu^2(r)=1}} \phi(r) \geq \frac{R^{k+1}}{2^{k+1}} \sum_{\substack{r \in \mathcal{A}_{k+1}(R) \\ \frac{R^{k+1}}{2^{k+1}} < r \leq \frac{R^{k+1}}{2^k}, \mu^2(r)=1}} \frac{\phi(r)}{r} \\ \geq \frac{R^{k+1}}{2^{k+1}} \tilde{H}^{(k+1)} \left(\frac{R^{k+1}}{2^k}, \left(\frac{R}{2}, \dots, \frac{R}{2} \right), (R, \dots, R) \right) \\ \gg_k \frac{R^{2k+2}}{(\log R)^{Q(\frac{1}{\log \rho})} (\log \log R)^{3/2}},$$

by Theorem 2. Combine inequalities (1.2) and (1.3) to complete the proof. $\square$

Heuristic argument. We now present a heuristic argument for Theorem 1, first given by Ford [5] for the case $k = 1$. Before we start developing the heuristic we introduce some notation. For $a \in \mathbb{N}$ set

$$\tau_{k+1}(a) = |\{(d_1, \dots, d_k) : d_1 \dots d_k | a\}|,$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}^{(k+1)}(a) &= \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^k : \tau_{k+1}(a, (e^{y_1}, \dots, e^{y_k}), 2(e^{y_1}, \dots, e^{y_k})) \geq 1\} \\ &= \bigcup_{d_1 \cdots d_k | a} [\log(d_1/2), \log d_1] \times \cdots \times [\log(d_k/2), \log d_k],\end{aligned}$$

and

$$L^{(k+1)}(a) = \text{Vol}(\mathcal{L}^{(k+1)}(a)),$$

where “Vol” is here the k -dimensional Lebesgue measure. Assume now that $\log y_1, \dots, \log y_k$ have the same order of magnitude. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Write $n = ab$, where

$$a = \prod_{p^e \parallel n, p \leq 2y_1} p^e.$$

For simplicity assume that a is square-free and that $a \leq y_1^C$ for some large constant C . Consider the set

$$D_{k+1}(a) = \{(\log d_1, \dots, \log d_k) : d_1 \cdots d_k | a\}.$$

If $D_{k+1}(a)$ was well-distributed in $[0, \log a]^k$, then we would expect that

$$\tau_{k+1}(a, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y}) \approx \tau_{k+1}(a) \frac{(\log 2)^k}{(\log a)^k} \approx \frac{(k+1)^{\omega(a)}}{(\log y_1)^k},$$

which is ≥ 1 when $\omega(a) \geq m := \left\lfloor \frac{\log \log y_1}{\log \rho} \right\rfloor + O(1)$. We expect that

$$|\{n \leq x : \omega(a) = r\}| \approx \frac{x}{\log y_1} \frac{(\log \log y_1)^r}{r!}$$

(for the upper bound see Theorem 08 in [10]). Therefore, heuristically, we should have

$$H^{(k+1)}(x, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y}) \approx \frac{x}{\log y_1} \sum_{r \geq m} \frac{(\log \log y_1)^r}{r!} \asymp \frac{x}{(\log y_1)^{Q(\frac{1}{\log \rho})} (\log \log y_1)^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Comparing the above estimate with Theorem 1 we see that we are off by a factor of $\log \log y_1$. The problem arises from the fact that $D_{k+1}(a)$ is usually not well-distributed, but it has many clumps. A way to measure this is the quantity $L^{(k+1)}(a)$ defined above. Consider n with $\omega(a) = m$ and write $a = p_1 \cdots p_m$ with $p_1 < \cdots < p_m$. We expect that the primes $p_1, \dots, p_m$ are uniformly distributed on a $\log \log$ scale (see chapter 1 of [10]), that is

$$\log \log p_j \sim j \frac{\log \log y_1}{m} = j \log \rho + O(1).$$

But, by the Law of the Iterated Logarithm (see Theorem 11 in [10]), we expect deviations from the mean value of the order of $\sqrt{\log \log y_1}$. In particular, with probability tending to 1 there is a j such that

$$\log \log p_j \leq j \log \rho - \sqrt[3]{\log \log y_1}.$$

The elements of $D_{k+1}(a)$ live in $(k+1)^{m-j}$ translates of the set $D_{k+1}(p_1 \cdots p_j)$. Therefore

$$L^{(k+1)}(a) \leq (k+1)^{m-j} L^{(k+1)}(p_1 \cdots p_j) \lesssim (k+1)^m \exp\{-k \sqrt[3]{\log \log y_1}\},$$

which is much less than $\tau_{k+1}(a) = (k+1)^m$. So we must focus on abnormal numbers n for which

$$\log \log p_j \geq j \log \rho - O(1) \quad (1 \leq j \leq m).$$

The probability that an n has this property is about $\frac{1}{m}$ (Ford, [8]). Thus we are led to the refined estimate that

$$H^{(k+1)}(x, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y}) \asymp \frac{x}{(\log y_1)^{Q(\frac{1}{\log \rho})} (\log \log y_1)^{\frac{3}{2}}},$$

which turns out to be the correct one. It is worthwhile noticing here that the exponent $3/2$ of $\log \log y_1$ appears for the same reason for all k .

The proof of the upper bound in Theorem 1 is a generalization of the methods used in [5] and [6]. However, the methods used in these papers to get the lower bound fail when $k > 3$. To illustrate what we mean we first make some definitions. For $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_k)$ set $e^{\mathbf{u}} = (e^{u_1}, \dots, e^{u_k})$. Also, let

$$M_p(a) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} \tau_{k+1}(a, e^{\mathbf{u}}, 2e^{\mathbf{u}})^p d\mathbf{u}.$$

For $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_k)$ let $\chi_{\mathbf{d}}$ be the characteristic function of the k -dimensional cube $[\log \frac{d_1}{2}, \log d_1) \times \dots \times [\log \frac{d_k}{2}, \log d_k)$ and observe that

$$\begin{aligned} M_p(a) &= \sum_{d_1 \cdots d_k | a} \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} \left(\sum_{e_1 \cdots e_k | a} \chi_{\mathbf{d}}(\mathbf{u}) \chi_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathbf{u}) \right)^{p-1} d\mathbf{u} \\ (1.4) \quad &\approx \sum_{d_1 \cdots d_k | a} \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} \chi_{\mathbf{d}}(\mathbf{u}) |\{ \mathbf{e} : e_1 \cdots e_k | a, |\log(d_i/e_i)| \leq \log 2 \ (1 \leq i \leq k) \}|^{p-1} d\mathbf{u} \\ &\approx \sum_{d_1 \cdots d_k | a} |\{ \mathbf{e} : e_1 \cdots e_k | a, |\log(d_i/e_i)| \leq \log 2 \ (1 \leq i \leq k) \}|^{p-1}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$M_1(a) \approx \tau_{k+1}(a)$$

and

$$M_2(a) \approx |\{(\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{e}) : d_1 \cdots d_k | a, e_1 \cdots e_k | a, |\log(e_i/d_i)| \leq \log 2 \ (1 \leq i \leq k)\}|.$$

The main argument in [6] uses the first and second moments $M_1(a)$ and $M_2(a)$, respectively, to bound $L^{(2)}(a)$ from below. However, when $k > 3$, $M_2(a)$ is too large and the method breaks down. This forces us to consider p -th moments for $p \in (1, 2)$. The problem is that, whereas $M_1(a)$ and $M_2(a)$ have a straightforward combinatorial interpretation, as noticed above, $M_p(a)$ does not. In a sense, the first moment counts points in the space and the second moment counts pairs of points. So philosophically speaking, for $p \in (1, 2)$ $M_p(a)$ counts something between single points and pairs (this is captured by the fractional exponent $p - 1$ in the right hand side of (1.4)). To deal with this obstruction we apply Hölder's inequality in a way that allows us to continue using combinatorial arguments.

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank his advisor Kevin Ford for constant guidance and support and for pointing out paper [11], as well as for discussions that led to a simplification of the proof of Lemma 2.1.

2. PRELIMINARY RESULTS

Notation. Let $\omega(n)$ denote the number of distinct prime factors of n . Let $P^+(n)$ and $P^-(n)$ be the largest and smallest prime factors of n , respectively. Adopt the notational conventions $P^+(1) = 0$ and $P^-(1) = \infty$. For $1 \leq y \leq x$ we use the standard notation $\mathcal{P}(y, x) = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : p|n \Rightarrow y < p \leq x\}$. Finally, constants implied by $\ll$, $\gg$ and $\asymp$ might depend on several parameters, which will always be specified by a subscript.

We need some results from number theory and analysis. We start with a sieve estimate.

Lemma 2.1. *We have that*

$$(2.1) \quad |\{n \leq x : P^-(n) > z\}| \ll \frac{x}{\log z} \quad (1 < z \leq x)$$

and

$$(2.2) \quad \sum_{\substack{x/2 < n \leq x, \mu^2(n)=1 \\ P^-(n) > z}} \frac{\phi(n)}{n} \gg \frac{x}{\log z} \quad (2 < 2z \leq x).$$

Proof. Inequality (2.1) is a standard application of sieve methods (see Theorem 06 in [10] or Theorem 8.4 in [9]). By similar methods we may also show that

$$(2.3) \quad |\{x/2 < n \leq x : \mu^2(n) = 1, P^-(n) > z\}| \gg \frac{x}{\log z} \quad (2 < 2z \leq x).$$

Moreover, by Theorem 01 in [10] we have that

$$\sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ P^-(n) > z}} \frac{n}{\phi(n)} \ll \frac{x}{\log z}.$$

A simple application of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality completes the proof of (2.2). $\square$

Moreover, we need the following estimates for certain averages of arithmetic functions that satisfy a growth condition of multiplicative nature.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ be an arithmetic function. Assume that there exists a constant C_f depending only on f such that $f(ap) \leq C_f f(a)$ for all $a \in \mathbb{N}$ and all primes p with $(a, p) = 1$.*

(a) *For $3/2 \leq y \leq x$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that*

$$\sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{P}(y, x) \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{f(a)(\log a)^n}{a} \ll_c \frac{n^{2c-1}n!}{2^n} (\log x + 1)^n \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{P}(y, x) \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{f(a)}{a},$$

where c is a constant depending only on C_f .

(b) *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}$ and $3/2 \leq y \leq x \leq z^C$ for some $C > 0$. Then*

$$\sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{P}(y, x) \\ \mu^2(a)=1, a > z}} \frac{f(a)}{a} \log^A(P^+(a)) \ll_{C_f, A, C} \exp\left\{-\frac{\log z}{2 \log x}\right\} (\log x)^A \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{P}(y, x) \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{f(a)}{a}.$$

(c) Let $3/2 \leq y \leq x$, $h \geq 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Then

$$\sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{P}(y,x) \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{f(a)}{a} \frac{1}{\log^h(P^+(a) + x^\epsilon/a)} \ll_{C_f, h, \epsilon} \frac{1}{(\log x)^h} \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{P}(y,x) \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{f(a)}{a}.$$

Proof. (a) We claim that for all $n \geq 0$ and every number $x > 0$,

$$(2.4) \quad \sum_{m=0}^n \binom{n}{m} \frac{1}{n-m+1} \prod_{i=0}^{m-1} \left(x + \frac{i}{2}\right) \leq \prod_{i=1}^n \left(x + \frac{i}{2}\right).$$

Observe that each side of (2.4) is a polynomial of degree n in x . Therefore it suffices to compare the coefficients of x^r of the two sides. Note that the coefficient of x^r of the right hand side of (2.4) is equal to

$$(2.5) \quad \frac{1}{2^{n-r}} \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_{n-r} \leq n} i_1 \cdots i_{n-r},$$

where the sum is interpreted to be 1 if $r = n$. For each summand $i_1 \cdots i_{n-r}$ in the above expression there is a unique $s \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-r\}$ so that $i_{n-r} = n$, $i_{n-r-1} = n-1, \dots, i_{n-r-s+1} = n-s+1$ and $i_{n-r-s} < n-s$. So

$$(2.6) \quad \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_{n-r} \leq n} i_1 \cdots i_{n-r} = \sum_{s=0}^{n-r} n(n-1) \cdots (n-s+1) \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_{n-r-s} < n-s} i_1 \cdots i_{n-r-s}.$$

But the coefficient of x^r of the left hand side of (2.4) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m=r}^n \binom{n}{m} \frac{1}{n-m+1} \frac{1}{2^{m-r}} \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_{m-r} \leq m-1} i_1 \cdots i_{m-r} \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^{n-r} \binom{n}{s} \frac{1}{s+1} \frac{1}{2^{n-r-s}} \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_{n-r-s} < n-s} i_1 \cdots i_{n-r-s} \\ &= \frac{1}{2^{n-r}} \sum_{s=0}^{n-r} \frac{2^s}{(s+1)!} n(n-1) \cdots (n-s+1) \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_{n-r-s} < n-s} i_1 \cdots i_{n-r-s} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2^{n-r}} \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_{n-r} \leq n} i_1 \cdots i_{n-r}, \end{aligned}$$

by (2.6) and the inequality $2^s \leq (s+1)!$ for $s \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. This shows (2.4). Also, for every $r \geq 0$ Mertens's estimate on the sum $\sum_{p \leq t} \frac{\log p}{p}$ and partial summation imply that

$$(2.7) \quad \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{(\log p)^{r+1}}{p} = \frac{(\log x)^{r+1}}{r+1} + O((\log x)^r) \ll \frac{(\log x + 1)^{r+1}}{r+1}.$$

Call c_1 the implied constant in the above inequality. We shall prove the lemma with $c = c_1 C_f$. In fact, we are going to prove that

$$(2.8) \quad \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{P}(y,x) \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{f(a)(\log a)^n}{a} \leq (\log x + 1)^n \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(c + \frac{i}{2}\right) \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{P}(y,x) \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{f(a)}{a}$$

for all $n \geq 0$. We argue inductively. If $n = 0$, it is clear that (2.8) is true. Fix now $n \geq 0$ and suppose that (2.8) holds for all $m \leq n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{P}(y,x) \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{f(a)(\log a)^{n+1}}{a} &= \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{P}(y,x) \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{f(a)(\log a)^n}{a} \sum_{p|a} \log p \\ &= \sum_{y < p \leq x} \frac{\log p}{p} \sum_{\substack{b \in \mathcal{P}(y,x) \\ \mu^2(bp)=1}} \frac{f(bp)}{b} (\log b + \log p)^n \\ &\leq C_f \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{\log p}{p} \sum_{\substack{b \in \mathcal{P}(y,x) \\ \mu^2(b)=1}} \frac{f(b)}{b} \sum_{m=0}^n \binom{n}{m} (\log b)^m (\log p)^{n-m} \\ &= C_f \sum_{m=0}^n \binom{n}{m} \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{(\log p)^{1+n-m}}{p} \sum_{\substack{b \in \mathcal{P}(y,x) \\ \mu^2(b)=1}} \frac{f(b)(\log b)^m}{b}. \end{aligned}$$

So, by the induction hypothesis, (2.4) and (2.7), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{P}(y,x) \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{f(a)(\log a)^{n+1}}{a} &\leq c_1 C_f (\log x + 1)^{n+1} \sum_{m=0}^n \binom{n}{m} \frac{1}{n-m+1} \prod_{i=0}^{m-1} \left(c + \frac{i}{2}\right) \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{P}(y,x) \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{f(a)}{a} \\ &\leq c (\log x + 1)^{n+1} \prod_{i=1}^n \left(c + \frac{i}{2}\right) \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{P}(y,x) \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{f(a)}{a}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the inductive step and thus the proof of (2.8). Finally, observe that

$$\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(c + \frac{i}{2}\right) = \frac{1}{2^n} \frac{\Gamma(2c+n)}{\Gamma(2c)} \asymp_c \frac{n^{2c-1} n!}{2^n},$$

by Strling's formula.

(b) By part (a) we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{P}(y,x) \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{f(a)}{a^{1-1/(2 \log x)}} &= \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{P}(y,x) \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{f(a)}{a} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \frac{(\log a)^n}{(2 \log x)^n} \\
 (2.9) \quad &\ll_{C_f} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{n^{2c-1}}{4^n} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\log x}\right)^n \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{P}(y,x) \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{f(a)}{a} \\
 &\ll_{C_f} \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{P}(y,x) \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{f(a)}{a}
 \end{aligned}$$

for all $x \geq 3/2$, since $1 + \frac{1}{\log(3/2)} < 3.5$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{P}(y,x) \\ \mu^2(a)=1, a > z}} \frac{f(a)}{a} \log^A(P^+(a)) &= \sum_{y < p \leq x} \frac{(\log p)^A}{p} \sum_{\substack{b \in \mathcal{P}(y,p) \\ \mu^2(bp)=1, b > z/p}} \frac{f(bp)}{b} \\
 &\leq C_f \sum_{p \leq \min\{x,z\}} \frac{(\log p)^A}{p} \exp\left\{-\frac{\log(z/p)}{2 \log p}\right\} \sum_{\substack{b \in \mathcal{P}(y,p) \\ \mu^2(b)=1}} \frac{f(b)}{b^{1-1/(2 \log p)}} \\
 (2.10) \quad &+ C_f \sum_{\min\{x,z\} < p \leq x} \frac{(\log p)^A}{p} \sum_{\substack{b \in \mathcal{P}(y,x) \\ \mu^2(b)=1}} \frac{f(b)}{b} \\
 &\ll_{C_f} \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{P}(y,x) \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{f(a)}{a} \left(\sum_{p \leq \min\{x,z\}} \frac{(\log p)^A}{p} \exp\left\{-\frac{\log z}{2 \log p}\right\} + \sum_{\min\{x,z\} < p \leq x} \frac{(\log p)^A}{p} \right),
 \end{aligned}$$

by (2.9). Moreover, if $z < x$, then

$$(2.11) \quad \sum_{\min\{x,z\} < p \leq x} \frac{(\log p)^A}{p} \leq e^{1/2} \sum_{\min\{x,z\} < p \leq x} \frac{(\log p)^A}{p} \exp\left\{-\frac{\log z}{2 \log p}\right\}.$$

On the other hand, if $z \geq x$, then both sides of (2.11) are equal to zero. In any case, (2.11) holds. Combining this with (2.10) we find that

$$\sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{P}(y,x) \\ \mu^2(a)=1, a > z}} \frac{f(a)}{a} \log^A(P^+(a)) \ll_{C_f} \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{P}(y,x) \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{f(a)}{a} \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{(\log p)^A}{p} \exp\left\{-\frac{\log z}{2 \log p}\right\}.$$

So it suffices to show that

$$(2.12) \quad S := \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{(\log p)^A}{p} \exp\left\{-\frac{\log z}{2 \log p}\right\} \ll_{A,C} \exp\left\{-\frac{\log z}{2 \log x}\right\} (\log x)^A.$$

Set $\mu = \exp\{\frac{\log z}{2\log x}\}$. Note that $\mu \geq e^{1/(2C)} > 1$. Thus for $x \geq 100$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} S &\leq \sum_{1 \leq n \leq \sqrt{\log x}} \mu^{-n} \sum_{x^{1/(n+1)} < p \leq x^{1/n}} \frac{(\log p)^A}{p} + \exp\left\{-\frac{\log z}{2\sqrt{\log x}}\right\} \sum_{p \leq e\sqrt{\log x}} \frac{(\log p)^A}{p} \\ &\ll_A (\log x)^A \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\mu^n n^{A+1}} + \exp\left\{-\frac{\log z}{2\sqrt{\log x}}\right\} (\log x)^{|A|/2} \log \log x \\ &\ll_{A,C} (\log x)^A \exp\left\{-\frac{\log z}{2\log x}\right\}, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of part (b).

(c) Write

$$\sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{P}(y,x) \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{f(a)}{a \log^h(P^+(a) + x^\epsilon/a)} = T_1 + T_2,$$

where

$$T_1 = \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{P}(y,x) \\ \mu^2(a)=1, a \leq x^{\epsilon/2}}} \frac{f(a)}{a \log^h(P^+(a) + x^\epsilon/a)} \quad \text{and} \quad T_2 = \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{P}(y,x) \\ \mu^2(a)=1, a > x^{\epsilon/2}}} \frac{f(a)}{a \log^h(P^+(a) + x^\epsilon/a)}.$$

Then clearly

$$T_1 \ll_{h,\epsilon} (\log x)^{-h} \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{P}(y,x) \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{f(a)}{a}$$

as well as

$$T_2 \leq \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{P}(y,x) \\ \mu^2(a)=1, a > x^{\epsilon/2}}} \frac{f(a)}{a} \log^{-h}(P^+(a)) \ll_{C_f,h,\epsilon} (\log x)^{-h} \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{P}(y,x) \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{f(a)}{a},$$

by part (b), and the desired result follows. $\square$

Finally, we need a covering lemma which is a slightly different version of Lemma 3.15 in [4]. If r is a positive real number and I is a k -dimensional rectangle, then we denote with rI the rectangle which has the same center with I and r times its diameter. More formally, if $\mathbf{x}_0$ is the center of I , then $rI := \{r(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0) + \mathbf{x}_0 : \mathbf{x} \in I\}$. The lemma is then formulated as follows.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $I_1, \dots, I_N$ be k -dimensional cubes of the form $[a_1, b_1) \times \dots \times [a_k, b_k)$ ($b_1 - a_1 = \dots = b_k - a_k > 0$). Then there exists a sub-collection $I_{i_1}, \dots, I_{i_M}$ of mutually disjoint cubes such that*

$$\bigcup_{n=1}^N I_n \subset \bigcup_{m=1}^M 3I_{i_m}.$$

Remark 2.1. The above lemma is very useful in the following sense. If $A = \bigcup_{i=1}^N I_i \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ with I_i as in Lemma 2.3, then in order to control a sum of the form

$$\sum_{\substack{(\log p_1, \dots, \log p_k) \in A \\ p_j \text{ prime}}} f(p_1, \dots, p_k),$$

it suffices to estimate sums of the form

$$\sum_{e^{a_1} \leq p_1 < e^{b_1}} \cdots \sum_{e^{a_k} \leq p_k < e^{b_k}} f(p_1, \dots, p_k),$$

which are much easier to handle.

3. LOWER BOUNDS

Before we launch into the lower bounds proof we list some inequalities about $L^{(k+1)}$.

Lemma 3.1. (a) $L^{(k+1)}(a) \leq \min\{\tau_{k+1}(a)(\log 2)^k, (\log a + \log 2)^k\}$.

(b) If $(a, b) = 1$, then $L^{(k+1)}(ab) \leq \tau_{k+1}(a)L^{(k+1)}(b)$.

(c) If $p_1, \dots, p_m$ are distinct prime numbers, then

$$L^{(k+1)}(p_1 \cdots p_m) \leq \min_{1 \leq j \leq m} \{(k+1)^{m-j}(\log(p_1 \cdots p_j) + \log 2)^k\}.$$

Proof. The proof is very similar to the proof of Lemma 3.1 in [5]. □

For the rest of this section we assume that $y_1 > C_1$, where C_1 is a large enough positive constant, possibly depending on k, δ and c ; for if $y_1 \leq C_1$, then $\tilde{H}^{(k+1)}(x, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y}) \gg_{C_1} x$ and Theorem 2 follows immediately. The value of the constant C_1 will not be specified, but it can be computed effectively if one goes through the proof.

We now prove the following lemma which is the starting point to obtain a lower bound for $\tilde{H}^{(k+1)}(x, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y})$. Note that it is similar to Lemma 2.1 in [5] and Lemma 4.1 in [6].

Lemma 3.2. Let $k \geq 1$, $0 < \delta < 1$ and $c \geq 1$. Then for $x \geq 1$ and $3 \leq y_1 \leq y_2 \leq \cdots \leq y_k \leq y_1^c$ with $2^{k+1}y_1 \cdots y_k \leq x/y_1^\delta$ we have that

$$(3.1) \quad \tilde{H}^{(k+1)}(x, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y}) \gg_{k, \delta, c} \frac{x}{(\log y_1)^{k+1}} \sum_{\substack{P^+(a) \leq y_1 \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{\phi(a)}{a} \frac{L^{(k+1)}(a)}{a}.$$

Proof. Set $x' = x/(2^{k+1}y_1 \cdots y_k)$. Consider squarefree integers $n = ap_1 \cdots p_k b \in (x/2, x]$ such that

- (1) $a \leq y_1^{\delta/4}$;
- (2) $p_1, \dots, p_k$ are distinct prime numbers with $(\log(y_1/p_1), \dots, \log(y_k/p_k)) \in \mathcal{L}^{(k+1)}(a)$;
- (3) $P^-(b) > y_1^{\delta/4}$ and b has at most one prime factor in $(y_1^{\delta/4}, 2y_1^c]$.

Condition (2) is equivalent to the existence of positive integers $d_1, \dots, d_k$ such that $d_1 \cdots d_k | a$ and $y_i/p_i < d_i \leq 2y_i/p_i$, $i = 1, \dots, k$. In particular, $\tau_{k+1}(n, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y}) \geq 1$. Furthermore,

$$y_1^{1-\delta/4} \leq \frac{y_1}{a} \leq \frac{y_i}{d_i} < p_i \leq 2\frac{y_i}{d_i} \leq 2y_1^c.$$

Hence this representation of n , if it exists, is unique up to a possible permutation of $p_1, \dots, p_k$ and the prime factors of b lying in $(y_1^{\delta/4}, 2y_1^c]$. Since b has at most one prime factor in $(y_1^{\delta/4}, 2y_1^c]$, n has a bounded number of such representations. Fix a and $p_1, \dots, p_k$ and note that

$$(3.2) \quad X := \frac{x}{ap_1 \cdots p_k} \geq \frac{x}{y_1^{\delta/4} 2^k y_1 \cdots y_k} \geq 2y_1^{3\delta/4}.$$

Therefore

$$\sum_{b \text{ admissible}} \frac{\phi(b)}{b} \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{\substack{X/2 < b \leq X \\ P^-(b) > 2y_1^c, \mu^2(b)=1}} \frac{\phi(b)}{b} + \sum_{\substack{X/2 < p \leq X \\ p \notin \{p_1, \dots, p_k\}}} \frac{\phi(p)}{p} \right) \gg_{c,\delta} \frac{X}{\log y_1},$$

by (3.2), Lemma 2.1 and the Prime Number Theorem. Hence

$$(3.3) \quad \tilde{H}^{(k+1)}(x, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y}) \gg_{k,\delta,c} \frac{x}{\log y_1} \sum_{\substack{a \leq y_1^{\delta/4} \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{\phi(a)}{a^2} \sum_{\substack{(\log \frac{y_1}{p_1}, \dots, \log \frac{y_k}{p_k}) \in \mathcal{L}^{(k+1)}(a) \\ p_1, \dots, p_k \text{ distinct}}} \frac{\phi(p_1) \cdots \phi(p_k)}{p_1^2 \cdots p_k^2}.$$

Fix $a \leq y_1^{\delta/4}$. Let $\{I_r\}_{r=1}^R$ be the collection of cubes $[\log(d_1/2), \log d_1] \times \cdots \times [\log(d_k/2), \log d_k]$ for $d_1 \cdots d_k | a$. Then for $I = [\log(d_1/2), \log d_1] \times \cdots \times [\log(d_k/2), \log d_k]$ in this collection we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(\log \frac{y_1}{p_1}, \dots, \log \frac{y_k}{p_k}) \in I} \frac{\phi(p_1) \cdots \phi(p_k)}{p_1^2 \cdots p_k^2} &= \prod_{i=1}^k \sum_{y_i/d_i < p_i \leq 2y_i/d_i} \frac{\phi(p_i)}{p_i^2} \gg_k \prod_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{\log(\max\{2, 2y_i/d_i\})} \\ &\gg_k \frac{1}{\log y_1 \cdots \log y_k} \end{aligned}$$

because $d | a$ implies that $d \leq y_1^{\delta/4}$. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{(\log \frac{y_1}{p_1}, \dots, \log \frac{y_k}{p_k}) \in I \\ p_1, \dots, p_k \text{ not distinct}}} \frac{\phi(p_1) \cdots \phi(p_k)}{p_1^2 \cdots p_k^2} &\leq \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} \prod_{\substack{t=1 \\ t \notin \{i,j\}}}^k \sum_{y_t/d_t < p_t \leq 2y_t/d_t} \frac{1}{p_t} \sum_{p_i > \max\{y_i, y_j\}/y_1^{\delta/4}} \frac{1}{p_i^2} \\ &\ll_k \frac{1}{y_1^{1/2}} \frac{1}{\log y_1 \cdots \log y_k}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\sum_{\substack{(\log \frac{y_1}{p_1}, \dots, \log \frac{y_k}{p_k}) \in I \\ p_1, \dots, p_k \text{ distinct}}} \frac{\phi(p_1) \cdots \phi(p_k)}{p_1^2 \cdots p_k^2} \gg_k \frac{1}{\log y_1 \cdots \log y_k} \gg_{k,c} \frac{1}{(\log y_1)^k},$$

provided that C_1 is large enough. By Lemma 2.3, there exists a sub-collection $\{I_{r_s}\}_{s=1}^S$ of mutually disjoint cubes such that

$$S(\log 2)^k = \text{Vol}\left(\bigcup_{s=1}^S I_{r_s}\right) \geq \frac{1}{3^k} \text{Vol}\left(\bigcup_{r=1}^R I_r\right) = \frac{L^{(k+1)}(a)}{3^k}.$$

Hence

$$\sum_{\substack{(\log \frac{y_1}{p_1}, \dots, \log \frac{y_k}{p_k}) \in \mathcal{L}^{(k+1)}(a) \\ p_1, \dots, p_k \text{ distinct}}} \frac{\phi(p_1) \cdots \phi(p_k)}{p_1^2 \cdots p_k^2} \geq \sum_{s=1}^S \sum_{\substack{(\log \frac{y_1}{p_1}, \dots, \log \frac{y_k}{p_k}) \in I_{r_s} \\ p_1, \dots, p_k \text{ distinct}}} \frac{\phi(p_1) \cdots \phi(p_k)}{p_1^2 \cdots p_k^2} \gg_{k,c} \frac{L^{(k+1)}(a)}{(\log y_1)^k},$$

which together with (3.3) implies that

$$(3.4) \quad \tilde{H}^{(k+1)}(x, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y}) \gg_{k,\delta,c} \frac{x}{(\log y_1)^{k+1}} \sum_{\substack{a \leq y_1^{\delta/4} \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{\phi(a)}{a} \frac{L^{(k+1)}(a)}{a}.$$

Note that the arithmetic function $a \rightarrow L^{(k+1)}(a)\phi(a)/a$ satisfies the hypothesis of Lemma 2.2 with $C_f = k+1$, by Lemma 3.1(b). Hence if $M = M(k)$ is sufficiently large, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{a \leq y_1^{\delta/4} \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{\phi(a)}{a} \frac{L^{(k+1)}(a)}{a} &\geq \sum_{\substack{P^+(a) \leq y_1^{\delta/M} \\ \mu^2(a)=1, a \leq y_1^{\delta/4}}} \frac{\phi(a)}{a} \frac{L^{(k+1)}(a)}{a} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{P^+(a) \leq y_1^{\delta/M} \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{\phi(a)}{a} \frac{L^{(k+1)}(a)}{a} (1 + O_k(e^{-M/8})) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{P^+(a) \leq y_1^{\delta/M} \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{\phi(a)}{a} \frac{L^{(k+1)}(a)}{a}, \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 2.2(b). So

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{P^+(a) \leq y_1 \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{\phi(a)}{a} \frac{L^{(k+1)}(a)}{a} &\leq \sum_{\substack{P^+(a_1) \leq y_1^{\delta/M} \\ \mu^2(a_1)=1}} \frac{\phi(a_1)}{a_1} \frac{L^{(k+1)}(a_1)}{a_1} \sum_{\substack{a_2 \in \mathcal{P}(y_1^{\delta/M}, y_1) \\ \mu^2(a_2)=1}} \frac{\tau_{k+1}(a_2)\phi(a_2)}{a_2^2} \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{\substack{a_1 \leq y_1^{\delta/4} \\ \mu^2(a_1)=1}} \frac{\phi(a_1)}{a_1} \frac{L^{(k+1)}(a_1)}{a_1} \prod_{y_1^{\delta/M} < p \leq y_1} \left(1 + \frac{(k+1)(p-1)}{p^2}\right) \\ &\ll_{k,\delta} \sum_{\substack{a_1 \leq y_1^{\delta/4} \\ \mu^2(a_1)=1}} \frac{\phi(a_1)}{a_1} \frac{L^{(k+1)}(a_1)}{a_1}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used Lemma 3.1(b). Inserting the above estimate into (3.4) completes the proof. $\square$

Given $P \in (1, +\infty)$ and $a \in \mathbb{N}$ set

$$W_{k+1}^P(a) = \sum_{d_1 \cdots d_k | a} \left| \left\{ (d'_1, \dots, d'_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k : d'_1 \cdots d'_k | a, \left| \log \frac{d'_i}{d_i} \right| < \log 2 \ (1 \leq i \leq k) \right\} \right|^{P-1}.$$

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a finite set of positive integers and $P \in (1, +\infty)$. Then*

$$\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{\tau_{k+1}(a)}{a} \leq \left(\frac{1}{(\log 2)^k} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{L^{(k+1)}(a)}{a} \right)^{1-1/P} \left(\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{W_{k+1}^P(a)}{a} \right)^{1/P}.$$

Proof. For $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ let $\chi_{\mathbf{d}}$ be the characteristic function of the k -dimensional cube $[\log(d_1/2), \log d_1) \times \cdots \times [\log(d_k/2), \log d_k)$. Then it is easy to see that

$$\tau_{k+1}(a, e^{\mathbf{u}}, 2e^{\mathbf{u}}) = \sum_{d_1 \cdots d_k | a} \chi_{\mathbf{d}}(\mathbf{u})$$

for all $a \in \mathbb{N}$, where $e^{\mathbf{u}} = (e^{u_1}, \dots, e^{u_k})$ for $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$. Hence

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^k} \tau_{k+1}(a, e^{\mathbf{u}}, 2e^{\mathbf{u}}) d\mathbf{u} = \tau_{k+1}(a) (\log 2)^k$$

and a double application of Hölder's inequality yields

$$(3.5) \quad (\log 2)^k \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{\tau_{k+1}(a)}{a} \leq \left(\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{1}{a} \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} \tau_{k+1}(a, e^{\mathbf{u}}, 2e^{\mathbf{u}})^P d\mathbf{u} \right)^{1/P} \left(\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{L^{(k+1)}(a)}{a} \right)^{1-1/P}.$$

Finally, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{k+1}(a, e^{\mathbf{u}}, 2e^{\mathbf{u}})^P &= \sum_{\substack{d_1 \cdots d_k | a \\ u_i < \log d_i \leq u_i + \log 2 \\ 1 \leq i \leq k}} \tau_{k+1}(a, e^{\mathbf{u}}, 2e^{\mathbf{u}})^{P-1} = \sum_{\substack{d_1 \cdots d_k | a \\ u_i < \log d_i \leq u_i + \log 2 \\ 1 \leq i \leq k}} \left(\sum_{\substack{d'_1 \cdots d'_k | a \\ u_i < \log d'_i \leq u_i + \log 2 \\ 1 \leq i \leq k}} 1 \right)^{P-1} \\ &\leq \sum_{\substack{d_1 \cdots d_k | a \\ u_i < \log d_i \leq u_i + \log 2 \\ 1 \leq i \leq k}} \left(\sum_{\substack{d'_1 \cdots d'_k | a \\ |\log(d'_i/d_i)| < \log 2 \\ 1 \leq i \leq k}} 1 \right)^{P-1}. \end{aligned}$$

So

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^k} \tau(a, e^{\mathbf{u}}, 2e^{\mathbf{u}})^P d\mathbf{u} \leq \sum_{d_1 \cdots d_k | a} \left(\sum_{\substack{d'_1 \cdots d'_k | a \\ |\log(d'_i/d_i)| < \log 2 \\ 1 \leq i \leq k}} 1 \right)^{P-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} \chi_{\mathbf{d}}(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} = (\log 2)^k W_{k+1}^P(a),$$

which together with (3.5) completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

Our next goal is to estimate

$$\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{W_{k+1}^P(a)}{a}$$

for suitably chosen sets $\mathcal{A}$. This will be done in Lemmas 3.5, 3.6 and 3.8. First, we introduce some notation.

We generalize the construction of a sequence of primes $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots$ found in [5] and [6]. Set $\lambda_0 = \min\{p \text{ prime} : p \geq k+1\} - 1$. Then define inductively λ_j as the largest prime such that

$$(3.6) \quad \sum_{\lambda_{j-1} < p \leq \lambda_j} \frac{1}{p} \leq \log \rho.$$

Note that $1/(\lambda_0 + 1) \leq 1/(k+1) < \log \rho$ because $(k+1) \log \rho = \frac{k+1}{k} \log(k+1)$ is an increasing function of k and $\log 4 > 1$. Thus the sequence $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ is well-defined. Set

$$D_j = \{p \text{ prime} : \lambda_{j-1} < p \leq \lambda_j\}$$

and $\log \lambda_j = \rho^{\mu_j}$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Then we have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.4. *There exists a constant ℓ_k such that*

$$\mu_j = j + \ell_k + O_k(\rho^{-j}) \quad (j \in \mathbb{N}).$$

In particular, there exists a positive integer L_k such that

$$|\mu_j - j| \leq L_k \quad (j \in \mathbb{N}).$$

Proof. By the Prime Number Theorem with de la Valee Poussin error term [1, p. 111], there exists some positive constant c_1 such that

$$(3.7) \quad \log_2 \lambda_j - \log_2 \lambda_{j-1} = \log \rho + O(e^{-c_1 \sqrt{\log \lambda_{j-1}}})$$

for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. In addition, $\lambda_j \rightarrow \infty$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, by construction. So if we fix $\rho' \in (1, \rho)$, then (3.7) implies that

$$\frac{\log \lambda_j}{\log \lambda_{j-1}} \geq \rho'$$

for sufficiently large j , which in turn implies that the series $\sum_j e^{-c_1 \sqrt{\log \lambda_j}}$ converges. Thus, telescoping the summation of (3.7) yields that $\mu_j = j + O_k(1)$, and hence $\log \lambda_j \gg_k \rho^j$. Summing (3.7) again, this time for $j = r+1, \dots, s$, we get that

$$\mu_s - \mu_r = s - r + O_k(\rho^{-r}).$$

Hence $\{\mu_j - j\}$ is a Cauchy sequence and so it converges, say to ℓ_k . Finally, letting $s \rightarrow \infty$ gives us the desired result. $\square$

For $R \in \mathbb{N}$ let

$$\mathcal{P}_R = \{(Y_1, \dots, Y_k) : Y_i \subset \{1, \dots, R\}, Y_i \cap Y_j = \emptyset \text{ if } i \neq j\}.$$

Also, for $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_k) \in \mathcal{P}_R$ and $\mathbf{I} = (I_1, \dots, I_k) \in \{0, 1, \dots, R\}^k$ set

$$M_R(\mathbf{Y}; \mathbf{I}) = \left| \left\{ (Z_1, \dots, Z_k) \in \mathcal{P}_R : \bigcup_{r=j}^k (Z_r \cap (I_j, R]) = \bigcup_{r=j}^k (Y_r \cap (I_j, R]) \quad (1 \leq j \leq k) \right\} \right|.$$

For $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_H) \in (\mathbb{N} \cup \{0\})^H$ let $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{b})$ be the set of square-free integers composed of exactly b_j prime factors from D_j for each j . Set $B = b_1 + \dots + b_H$, $B_0 = 0$ and $B_i = b_1 + \dots + b_i$

for all $i = 1, \dots, H$. For $I \in \{0, 1, \dots, B\}$ define $E_{\mathbf{b}}(I)$ by $B_{E_{\mathbf{b}}(I)-1} < I \leq B_{E_{\mathbf{b}}(I)}$ if $I > 0$ and set $E_{\mathbf{b}}(I) = 0$ if $I = 0$. Lastly, for $\{X_j\}_{j \in J}$ a family of sets define

$$\mathcal{U}(\{X_j : j \in J\}) = \left\{ x \in \bigcup_{j \in J} X_j : |\{i \in J : x \in X_i\}| = 1 \right\}.$$

In particular,

$$\mathcal{U}(\{X_1, X_2\}) = X_1 \triangle X_2,$$

the symmetric difference of X_1 and X_2 , and

$$\mathcal{U}(\emptyset) = \emptyset.$$

Remark 3.1. Assume that $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$ and $Z_1, \dots, Z_n$ satisfy $Y_i \cap Y_j = Z_i \cap Z_j = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$. Then the condition

$$\mathcal{U}(\{Y_j \triangle Z_j : 1 \leq j \leq n\}) = \emptyset$$

is equivalent to

$$\bigcup_{j=1}^n Y_j = \bigcup_{j=1}^n Z_j.$$

Lemma 3.5. *Let $k \geq 1$, $P \in (1, 2]$ and $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_H) \in (\mathbb{N} \cup \{0\})^H$. Then*

$$\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{b})} \frac{W_{k+1}^P(a)}{a} \ll_k \frac{(\log \rho)^B}{b_1! \cdots b_H!} \sum_{0 \leq I_1, \dots, I_k \leq B} \prod_{j=1}^k (\rho^{P-1})^{-E_{\mathbf{b}}(I_j)} \sum_{\mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{P}_B} (M_B(\mathbf{Y}; \mathbf{I}))^{P-1}.$$

Proof. Let $a = p_1 \cdots p_B \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{b})$, where

$$(3.8) \quad p_{B_{i-1}+1}, \dots, p_{B_i} \in D_i \quad (1 \leq i \leq H),$$

and the primes in each interval D_j for $j = 1, \dots, H$ are unordered. Observe that, since $p_1 \cdots p_B$ is square-free and has precisely B prime factors, the k -tuples $(d_1, \dots, d_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k$ with $d_1 \cdots d_k | p_1 \cdots p_B$ are in one to one correspondence with k -tuples $(Y_1, \dots, Y_k) \in \mathcal{P}_B$; this correspondence is given by

$$d_j = \prod_{i \in Y_j} p_i \quad (1 \leq j \leq k).$$

Using this observation twice we find that

$$\begin{aligned} W_{k+1}^P(p_1 \cdots p_B) &= \sum_{(Y_1, \dots, Y_k) \in \mathcal{P}_B} \left| \left\{ (d'_1, \dots, d'_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k : d'_1 \cdots d'_k | a, \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left| \log d'_j - \sum_{i \in Y_j} \log p_i \right| < \log 2 \quad (1 \leq j \leq k) \right\} \Big|^{P-1} \\ &= \sum_{(Y_1, \dots, Y_k) \in \mathcal{P}_B} \left(\sum_{\substack{(Z_1, \dots, Z_k) \in \mathcal{P}_B \\ (3.9)}} 1 \right)^{P-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where for two k -tuples $(Y_1, \dots, Y_k)$ and $(Z_1, \dots, Z_k)$ in $\mathcal{P}_B$ condition (3.9) is defined by

$$(3.9) \quad -\log 2 < \sum_{i \in Y_j} \log p_i - \sum_{i \in Z_j} \log p_i < \log 2 \quad (1 \leq j \leq k).$$

Moreover, every integer $a \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{b})$ has exactly $b_1! \cdots b_H!$ representations of the form $a = p_1 \cdots p_B$, corresponding to the possible permutations of the primes $p_1, \dots, p_B$ under condition (3.8). Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{b})} \frac{W_{k+1}^P(a)}{a} &= \frac{1}{b_1! \cdots b_H!} \sum_{\substack{p_1, \dots, p_B \\ (3.8)}} \frac{1}{p_1 \cdots p_B} \sum_{(Y_1, \dots, Y_k) \in \mathcal{P}_B} \left(\sum_{\substack{(Z_1, \dots, Z_k) \in \mathcal{P}_B \\ (3.9)}} 1 \right)^{P-1} \\
&= \frac{1}{b_1! \cdots b_H!} \sum_{(Y_1, \dots, Y_k) \in \mathcal{P}_B} \sum_{\substack{p_1, \dots, p_B \\ (3.8)}} \frac{1}{p_1 \cdots p_B} \left(\sum_{\substack{(Z_1, \dots, Z_k) \in \mathcal{P}_B \\ (3.9)}} 1 \right)^{P-1} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{b_1! \cdots b_H!} \sum_{(Y_1, \dots, Y_k) \in \mathcal{P}_B} \left(\sum_{\substack{p_1, \dots, p_B \\ (3.8)}} \frac{1}{p_1 \cdots p_B} \right)^{2-P} \\
&\quad \times \left(\sum_{\substack{p_1, \dots, p_B \\ (3.8)}} \frac{1}{p_1 \cdots p_B} \sum_{\substack{(Z_1, \dots, Z_k) \in \mathcal{P}_B \\ (3.9)}} 1 \right)^{P-1},
\end{aligned}$$

by Hölder's inequality if $P < 2$ and trivially if $P = 2$. Observe that

$$\sum_{\substack{p_1, \dots, p_B \\ (3.8)}} \frac{1}{p_1 \cdots p_B} \leq \prod_{j=1}^H \left(\sum_{p \in D_j} \frac{1}{p} \right)^{b_j} \leq (\log \rho)^B,$$

by (3.6). Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{b})} \frac{W_{k+1}^P(a)}{a} &\leq \frac{(\log \rho)^{(2-P)B}}{b_1! \cdots b_H!} \sum_{(Y_1, \dots, Y_k) \in \mathcal{P}_B} \left(\sum_{\substack{p_1, \dots, p_B \\ (3.8)}} \frac{1}{p_1 \cdots p_B} \sum_{\substack{(Z_1, \dots, Z_k) \in \mathcal{P}_B \\ (3.9)}} 1 \right)^{P-1} \\
(3.10) \quad &= \frac{(\log \rho)^{(2-P)B}}{b_1! \cdots b_H!} \sum_{(Y_1, \dots, Y_k) \in \mathcal{P}_B} \left(\sum_{\substack{(Z_1, \dots, Z_k) \in \mathcal{P}_B \\ (3.9)}} \sum_{\substack{p_1, \dots, p_B \\ (3.8)}} \frac{1}{p_1 \cdots p_B} \right)^{P-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we fix $(Y_1, \dots, Y_k) \in \mathcal{P}_B$ and $(Z_1, \dots, Z_k) \in \mathcal{P}_B$ and proceed to the estimation of the sum

$$\sum_{\substack{p_1, \dots, p_B \\ (3.8), (3.9)}} \frac{1}{p_1 \cdots p_B}.$$

Note that (3.9) is equivalent to

$$(3.11) \quad -\log 2 < \sum_{i \in Y_j \setminus Z_j} \log p_i - \sum_{i \in Z_j \setminus Y_j} \log p_i < \log 2 \quad (1 \leq j \leq k).$$

Conditions (3.11), $1 \leq j \leq k$, are a system of k inequalities. For every $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and every $I_j \in Y_j \triangle Z_j$ (3.11) implies that $p_{I_j} \in [X_j, 4X_j]$, where X_j is a constant depending only on the primes p_i for $i \in Y_j \triangle Z_j \setminus \{I_j\}$. In order to exploit this simple observation to its full potential we need to choose $I_1, \dots, I_k$ as large as possible. After this is done, we fix the

primes p_i for $i \in \{1, \dots, B\} \setminus \{I_1, \dots, I_k\}$ and estimate the sum over $p_{I_1}, \dots, p_{I_k}$. The obvious choice is to set $I_j = \max Y_j \triangle Z_j$, $1 \leq j \leq k$. However, in this case the indices $I_1, \dots, I_k$ and the numbers $X_1, \dots, X_k$ might be interdependent in a complicated way, which would make the estimation of the sum over $p_{I_1}, \dots, p_{I_k}$ very hard. So it is important to choose large $I_1, \dots, I_k$ for which at the same time the dependence of $X_1, \dots, X_k$ is simple enough to allow the estimation of the sum over $p_{I_1}, \dots, p_{I_k}$. What we will do is to construct large $I_1, \dots, I_k$ such that if we fix the primes p_i for $i \in \{1, \dots, B\} \setminus \{I_1, \dots, I_k\}$, then (3.11) becomes a linear system of inequalities with respect to $\log p_{I_1}, \dots, \log p_{I_k}$ that corresponds to a triangular matrix and hence is easily solvable (actually, we have to be slightly more careful, but this is the main idea).

Define $I_1, \dots, I_k$ and $m_1, \dots, m_k$ with $I_i \in (Y_{m_i} \triangle Z_{m_i}) \cup \{0\}$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ inductively, as follows. Let

$$I_1 = \max\{\mathcal{U}(Y_1 \triangle Z_1, \dots, Y_k \triangle Z_k) \cup \{0\}\}.$$

If $I_1 = 0$, set $m_1 = 1$. Else, define m_1 to be the unique element of $\{1, \dots, k\}$ so that $I_1 \in Y_{m_1} \triangle Z_{m_1}$. Assume we have defined $I_1, \dots, I_i$ and $m_1, \dots, m_i$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$ with $I_r \in (Y_{m_r} \triangle Z_{m_r}) \cup \{0\}$ for $r = 1, \dots, i$. Then set

$$I_{i+1} = \max\{\mathcal{U}(\{Y_j \triangle Z_j : j \in \{1, \dots, k\} \setminus \{m_1, \dots, m_i\}\}) \cup \{0\}\}.$$

If $I_{i+1} = 0$, set $m_{i+1} = \min\{\{1, \dots, k\} \setminus \{m_1, \dots, m_i\}\}$. Otherwise, define m_{i+1} to be the unique element of $\{1, \dots, k\} \setminus \{m_1, \dots, m_i\}$ such that $I_{i+1} \in Y_{m_{i+1}} \triangle Z_{m_{i+1}}$. This completes the inductive step. Let $\{1 \leq j \leq k : I_j > 0\} = \{j_1, \dots, j_n\}$, where $j_1 < \dots < j_n$ and put $\mathcal{J} = \{m_{j_r} : 1 \leq r \leq n\}$. Notice that, by construction, we have that $\{m_1, \dots, m_k\} = \{1, \dots, k\}$ and $I_{j_r} \neq I_{j_s}$ for $1 \leq r < s \leq n$.

Fix the primes p_i for $i \in \mathcal{I} = \{1, \dots, B\} \setminus \{I_{j_1}, \dots, I_{j_n}\}$. By the definition of the indices $I_1, \dots, I_k$, for every $r \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ the prime number $p_{I_{j_r}}$ appears in (3.11) for $j = m_{j_r}$, but does not appear in (3.11) for $j \in \{m_{j_{r+1}}, \dots, m_{j_n}\}$. So (3.11), $j \in \mathcal{J}$, is a linear system with respect to $\log p_{I_{j_1}}, \dots, \log p_{I_{j_n}}$ corresponding to a triangular matrix (up to a permutation of its rows) and a straightforward manipulation of its rows implies that $p_{I_{j_r}} \in [V_r, 4^k V_r]$, $1 \leq r \leq n$, for some numbers V_r that depend only on the primes p_i for $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and the k -tuples $(Y_1, \dots, Y_k)$ and $(Z_1, \dots, Z_k)$, which we have fixed. Therefore

$$\sum_{\substack{p_{I_{j_1}}, \dots, p_{I_{j_n}} \\ (3.8), (3.9)}} \frac{1}{p_{I_{j_1}} \cdots p_{I_{j_n}}} \leq \prod_{r=1}^n \sum_{\substack{V_r \leq p_{I_{j_r}} \leq 4^k V_r \\ p_{I_{j_r}} \in D_{E_b(I_{j_r})}}} \frac{1}{p_{I_{j_r}}} \ll_k \prod_{r=1}^n \frac{1}{\log(\max\{V_r, \lambda_{E_b(I_{j_r})-1}\})} \ll_k \prod_{r=1}^n \rho^{-E_b(I_{j_r})}$$

and consequently

$$\sum_{\substack{p_1, \dots, p_B \\ (3.8), (3.9)}} \frac{1}{p_1 \cdots p_B} \ll_k \prod_{r=1}^n \rho^{-E_b(I_{j_r})} \sum_{\substack{p_i, i \in \mathcal{I} \\ (3.8)}} \prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{1}{p_i} \leq (\log \rho)^{B-n} \prod_{j=1}^k \rho^{-E_b(I_j)},$$

by (3.6). Inserting the above estimate into (3.10) we deduce that

$$(3.12) \quad \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{b})} \frac{W_{k+1}^P(a)}{a} \ll_k \frac{(\log \rho)^B}{b_1! \cdots b_H!} \sum_{(Y_1, \dots, Y_k) \in \mathcal{P}_B} \left(\sum_{(Z_1, \dots, Z_k) \in \mathcal{P}_B} \prod_{j=1}^k \rho^{-E_b(I_j)} \right)^{P-1}.$$

Next, observe that the definition of $I_1, \dots, I_k$ implies that

$$(I_j, B] \cap \mathcal{U}(\{Y_{m_r} \triangle Z_{m_r} : j \leq r \leq k\}) = \emptyset \quad (1 \leq j \leq k)$$

or, equivalently,

$$\bigcup_{r=j}^k (Z_{m_r} \cap (I_j, B]) = \bigcup_{r=j}^k (Y_{m_r} \cap (I_j, B]) \quad (1 \leq j \leq k),$$

by Remark 3.1. Hence for fixed $(Y_1, \dots, Y_k) \in \mathcal{P}_B$, $I_1, \dots, I_k \in \{0, 1, \dots, B\}$ and $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_k)$ with $\{m_1, \dots, m_k\} = \{1, \dots, k\}$, the number of admissible k -tuples $(Z_1, \dots, Z_k) \in \mathcal{P}_B$ is at most $M_B(\mathbf{Y}_{\mathbf{m}}; \mathbf{I})$, where $\mathbf{Y}_{\mathbf{m}} = (Y_{m_1}, \dots, Y_{m_k})$, which together with (3.12) yields that

$$\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{b})} \frac{W_{k+1}^P(a)}{a} \ll_k \frac{(\log \rho)^B}{b_1! \cdots b_H!} \sum_{\mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{P}_B} \left(\sum_{0 \leq I_1, \dots, I_k \leq B} \sum_{\mathbf{m}} M_B(\mathbf{Y}_{\mathbf{m}}; \mathbf{I}) \prod_{j=1}^k \rho^{-E_b(I_j)} \right)^{P-1}.$$

So, by the inequality $(a+b)^{P-1} \leq a^{P-1} + b^{P-1}$ for $a \geq 0$ and $b \geq 0$, which holds precisely when $1 < P \leq 2$, we find that

$$\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{b})} \frac{W_{k+1}^P(a)}{a} \ll_k \frac{(\log \rho)^B}{b_1! \cdots b_H!} \sum_{\mathbf{m}} \sum_{0 \leq I_1, \dots, I_k \leq B} \prod_{j=1}^k (\rho^{P-1})^{-E_b(I_j)} \sum_{\mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{P}_B} (M_B(\mathbf{Y}_{\mathbf{m}}; \mathbf{I}))^{P-1}.$$

Finally, note that

$$\sum_{\mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{P}_B} (M_B(\mathbf{Y}_{\mathbf{m}}; \mathbf{I}))^{P-1} = \sum_{\mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{P}_B} (M_B(\mathbf{Y}; \mathbf{I}))^{P-1}$$

for every $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_k)$ with $\{m_1, \dots, m_k\} = \{1, \dots, k\}$, which completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

Lemma 3.6. *Let $P \in (1, +\infty)$ and $0 \leq I_1, \dots, I_k \leq B$ so that $I_{\sigma(1)} \leq \dots \leq I_{\sigma(k)}$ for some permutation $\sigma \in S_k$. Then*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{P}_B} (M_B(\mathbf{Y}; \mathbf{I}))^{P-1} \leq (k+1)^B \prod_{j=1}^k \left(\frac{j-1 + (k-j+2)^P}{j + (k-j+1)^P} \right)^{I_{\sigma(j)}}.$$

Proof. First, we calculate $M_B(\mathbf{Y}; \mathbf{I})$ for fixed $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_k) \in \mathcal{P}_B$. Set $I_0 = 0$, $I_{k+1} = B$, $\sigma(0) = 0$, $\sigma(k+1) = k+1$ and

$$\mathcal{N}_j = (I_{\sigma(j)}, I_{\sigma(j+1)}] \cap \{1, \dots, B\} \quad (0 \leq j \leq k).$$

In addition, put

$$Y_0 = \{1, \dots, B\} \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^k Y_j$$

as well as

$$(3.13) \quad Y_{i,j} = Y_j \cap \mathcal{N}_i \quad \text{and} \quad y_{i,j} = |Y_{i,j}| \quad (0 \leq i \leq k, 0 \leq j \leq k).$$

A k -tuple $(Z_1, \dots, Z_k) \in \mathscr{P}_B$ is counted by $M_B(\mathbf{Y}; \mathbf{I})$ if, and only if,

$$(3.14) \quad \bigcup_{r=j}^k (Z_r \cap (I_j, B]) = \bigcup_{r=j}^k (Y_r \cap (I_j, B]) \quad (1 \leq j \leq k).$$

If we set

$$Z_0 = \{1, \dots, B\} \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^k Z_j$$

and

$$Z_{i,j} = Z_j \cap \mathcal{N}_i \quad (0 \leq i \leq k, 0 \leq j \leq k),$$

then (3.14) is equivalent to

$$(3.15) \quad \bigcup_{r=\sigma(j)}^k Z_{i,r} = \bigcup_{r=\sigma(j)}^k Y_{i,r} \quad (0 \leq i \leq k, 0 \leq j \leq i).$$

For every $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$ let

$$\chi_i : \{0, 1, \dots, i+1\} \rightarrow \{\sigma(0), \sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(i), \sigma(k+1)\}$$

be the bijection uniquely determined by the property that $\chi_i(0) < \dots < \chi_i(i+1)$. So the sequence $\chi_i(0), \dots, \chi_i(i+1)$ is the sequence $\sigma(0), \sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(i), \sigma(k+1)$ ordered increasingly. In particular, $\chi_i(0) = \sigma(0) = 0$ and $\chi_i(i+1) = \sigma(k+1) = k+1$. With this notation (3.15) becomes

$$\bigcup_{r=\chi_i(j)}^k Z_{i,r} = \bigcup_{r=\chi_i(j)}^k Y_{i,r} \quad (0 \leq i \leq k, 0 \leq j \leq i),$$

which is equivalent to

$$\bigcup_{r=\chi_i(j)}^{\chi_i(j+1)-1} Z_{i,r} = \bigcup_{r=\chi_i(j)}^{\chi_i(j+1)-1} Y_{i,r} \quad (0 \leq i \leq k, 0 \leq j \leq i).$$

For each $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$ let M_i denote the total number of mutually disjoint $(k+1)$ -tuples $(Z_{i,0}, Z_{i,1}, \dots, Z_{i,k})$ such that

$$\bigcup_{r=\chi_i(j)}^{\chi_i(j+1)-1} Z_{i,r} = \bigcup_{r=\chi_i(j)}^{\chi_i(j+1)-1} Y_{i,r} \quad (0 \leq j \leq i).$$

Then

$$(3.16) \quad M_B(\mathbf{Y}; \mathbf{I}) = \prod_{i=0}^k M_i.$$

Moreover, it is immediate from the definition of M_i that

$$M_i = \prod_{j=0}^i (\chi_i(j+1) - \chi_i(j))^{y_{i,\chi_i(j)} + \dots + y_{i,\chi_i(j+1)} - 1}.$$

Set $v_{i,j+1} = \chi_i(j+1) - \chi_i(j)$ for $j \in \{0, \dots, i\}$. Note that $v_{i,1} + \dots + v_{i,i+1} = k+1$ and that $v_{i,j+1} \geq 1$ for all $j \in \{0, \dots, i\}$. Let

$$(3.17) \quad W_{i,j} = \bigcup_{r=\chi_i(j)}^{\chi_i(j+1)-1} Y_{i,r}, \quad w_{i,j} = |W_{i,j}| \quad (0 \leq j \leq i).$$

With this notation we have that

$$(3.18) \quad M_i = \prod_{j=0}^i v_{i,j+1}^{w_{i,j}} \quad (0 \leq i \leq k).$$

Inserting (3.18) into (3.16) we deduce that

$$(3.19) \quad M_B(\mathbf{Y}; \mathbf{I}) = \prod_{i=0}^k \prod_{j=0}^i v_{i,j+1}^{w_{i,j}}.$$

Therefore

$$S := \sum_{\mathbf{Y}} (M_B(\mathbf{Y}; \mathbf{I}))^{P-1} = \prod_{i=0}^k \sum_{Y_{i,0}, \dots, Y_{i,k}} \prod_{j=0}^i (v_{i,j+1}^{P-1})^{w_{i,j}},$$

where the sets $Y_{i,j}$ are defined by (3.13). Next, we calculate S . Fix $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. Given $W_{i,0}, \dots, W_{i,i}$, a partition of $\mathcal{N}_i$, the number of $Y_{i,0}, \dots, Y_{i,k}$ satisfying (3.17) is

$$\prod_{j=0}^i (\chi_i(j+1) - \chi_i(j))^{|W_{i,j}|} = \prod_{j=0}^i v_{i,j+1}^{w_{i,j}}.$$

Hence

$$\sum_{Y_{i,0}, \dots, Y_{i,k}} \prod_{j=0}^i (v_{i,j+1}^{P-1})^{w_{i,j}} = \sum_{W_{i,0}, \dots, W_{i,i}} \prod_{j=0}^i (v_{i,j+1})^{P w_{i,j}} = (v_{i,1}^P + \dots + v_{i,i+1}^P)^{|\mathcal{N}_i|},$$

by the multinomial theorem. So

$$S = \prod_{i=0}^k (v_{i,1}^P + \dots + v_{i,i+1}^P)^{|\mathcal{N}_i|} = \prod_{i=0}^k (v_{i,1}^P + \dots + v_{i,i+1}^P)^{I_{\sigma(i+1)} - I_{\sigma(i)}}.$$

Finally, recall that $v_{i,1} + \dots + v_{i,i+1} = k+1$ as well as $v_{i,j+1} \geq 1$ for all $0 \leq j \leq i \leq k$, and note that

$$\max \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{i+1} x_j^P : \sum_{j=1}^{i+1} x_j = k+1, x_j \geq 1 \ (1 \leq j \leq i+1) \right\} = i + (k+1-i)^P,$$

since the maximum of a convex function in a simplex occurs at its vertices. Hence we conclude that

$$S \leq \prod_{i=0}^k (i + (k+1-i)^P)^{I_{\sigma(i+1)} - I_{\sigma(i)}} = (k+1)^B \prod_{i=1}^k \left(\frac{i-1 + (k-i+2)^P}{i + (k-i+1)^P} \right)^{I_{\sigma(i)}},$$

which completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

Set

$$P = \min \left\{ 2, \frac{(k+1)^2 (\log \rho)^2}{(k+1)^2 (\log \rho)^2 - 1} \right\}.$$

Since $(k+1) \log \rho = \frac{k+1}{k} \log(k+1) > 1$, we have that $1 < P \leq 2$ and thus Lemmas 3.5 and 3.6 can be applied. Moreover, for our choice of P the following crucial inequality holds.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $k \geq 1$ and P defined as above. Then*

$$\frac{i-1 + (k-i+2)^P}{k+1} < (\rho^{P-1})^{k-i+1} \quad (2 \leq i \leq k).$$

Proof. Set

$$f(x) = (k+1)(\rho^{P-1})^x + x - (x+1)^P - k, \quad x \in [0, k].$$

It suffices to show that $f(x) > 0$ for $1 \leq x \leq k-1$. Observe that $f(0) = f(k) = 0$. Moreover, since $1 < P \leq 2$, $f'''(x) > 0$ for all x . Hence f'' is strictly increasing. Note that

$$f''(k) = (P-1)^2 (\log \rho)^2 (k+1)^P - P(P-1)(k+1)^{P-2} \leq 0,$$

by our choice of P . Hence $f''(x) < 0$ for $x \in (0, k)$, that is f is a concave function and thus it is positive for $x \in (0, k)$. $\square$

Let $\mathcal{B}$ be the set of vectors $(b_1, \dots, b_H)$ such that $B_i \leq i$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, H\}$. Moreover, set

$$\lambda = \frac{(k+1)^P}{k^P + 1} > 1.$$

Lemma 3.8. *Let $k \geq 1$ and $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_H) \in \mathcal{B}$. Then*

$$\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{b})} \frac{W_{k+1}^P(a)}{a} \ll_k \frac{((k+1) \log \rho)^B}{b_1! \dots b_H!} \left(1 + \sum_{m=1}^H \lambda^{B_m - m} \right).$$

Proof. Set

$$t_i = \frac{i-1 + (k-i+2)^P}{k+1} \quad (1 \leq i \leq k+1).$$

Then Lemmas 3.5 and 3.6 imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{b})} \frac{W_{k+1}^P(a)}{a} &\ll_k \frac{((k+1) \log \rho)^B}{b_1! \cdots b_H!} \sum_{0 \leq I_1 \leq \cdots \leq I_k \leq B} \prod_{j=1}^k (\rho^{P-1})^{-E_{\mathbf{b}}(I_j)} \left(\frac{t_j}{t_{j+1}} \right)^{I_j} \\
&\ll_k \frac{((k+1) \log \rho)^B}{b_1! \cdots b_H!} \sum_{0=j_0 \leq j_1 \leq \cdots \leq j_k \leq H} (\rho^{P-1})^{-(j_1 + \cdots + j_k)} \\
&\quad \times \prod_{i=1}^k \sum_{B_{j_{i-1}} \leq I_i \leq B_{j_i}} \left(\frac{t_i}{t_{i+1}} \right)^{I_i} \\
&\ll_k \frac{((k+1) \log \rho)^B}{b_1! \cdots b_H!} \sum_{0 \leq j_1 \leq \cdots \leq j_k \leq H} \prod_{i=1}^k (\rho^{P-1})^{-j_i} \left(\frac{t_i}{t_{i+1}} \right)^{B_{j_i}},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

since $t_1 > \cdots > t_k > t_{k+1} = 1$. Moreover,

$$\prod_{i=1}^k \left(\frac{t_i}{t_{i+1}} \right)^{B_{j_i}} \leq \left(\frac{t_1}{t_2} \right)^{B_{j_1}} \prod_{i=2}^k \left(\frac{t_i}{t_{i+1}} \right)^{j_i} = \left(\frac{t_1}{t_2} \right)^{B_{j_1}} t_2^{j_1} \prod_{i=2}^k t_i^{j_i - j_{i-1}},$$

since $\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{B}$. Thus, by setting $r_1 = j_1$ and $r_i = j_i - j_{i-1}$ for $i = 2, \dots, k$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
\prod_{i=1}^k (\rho^{P-1})^{-j_i} \left(\frac{t_i}{t_{i+1}} \right)^{B_{j_i}} &\leq (\rho^{P-1})^{-(j_1 + \cdots + j_k)} \left(\frac{t_1}{t_2} \right)^{B_{j_1}} t_2^{j_1} \prod_{i=2}^k t_i^{j_i - j_{i-1}} \\
&= \left(\frac{t_1}{t_2} \right)^{B_{r_1}} \left(\frac{t_2}{\rho^{(P-1)k}} \right)^{r_1} \prod_{i=2}^k \left(\frac{t_i}{(\rho^{P-1})^{k-i+1}} \right)^{r_i} \\
&= \lambda^{B_{r_1} - r_1} \prod_{i=2}^k \left(\frac{t_i}{(\rho^{P-1})^{k-i+1}} \right)^{r_i},
\end{aligned}$$

since $\rho^{(P-1)k} = t_1$ and $t_1/t_2 = \lambda$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{0 \leq j_1 \leq \cdots \leq j_k \leq H} \prod_{i=1}^k (\rho^{P-1})^{-j_i} \left(\frac{t_i}{t_{i+1}} \right)^{B_{j_i}} &\leq \sum_{\substack{r_1 + \cdots + r_k \leq H \\ r_i \geq 0 \ (1 \leq i \leq k)}} \lambda^{B_{r_1} - r_1} \prod_{i=2}^k \left(\frac{t_i}{(\rho^{P-1})^{k-i+1}} \right)^{r_i} \\
&\leq \sum_{\substack{0 \leq r_i \leq H \\ 1 \leq i \leq k}} \lambda^{B_{r_1} - r_1} \prod_{i=2}^k \left(\frac{t_i}{(\rho^{P-1})^{k-i+1}} \right)^{r_i} \\
&\ll_k \sum_{r_1=0}^H \lambda^{B_{r_1} - r_1},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

since $t_i < (\rho^{P-1})^{k-i+1}$ for $i = 2, \dots, k$ by Lemma 3.7. Inserting (3.21) into (3.20) completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

We will now use Lemmas 3.2, 3.3 and 3.8 to bound $\tilde{H}^{(k+1)}(x, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y})$ from below. Recall, from the beginning of this section, that we have assumed that $y_1 > C_1$ for a sufficiently large constant C_1 .

Lemma 3.9. *Let $k \geq 1$, $0 < \delta < 1$ and $c \geq 1$. Consider $x \geq 1$ and $3 \leq y_1 \leq y_2 \leq \dots \leq y_k \leq y_1^c$ with $2^{k+1}y_1 \dots y_k \leq x/y_1^\delta$. For a positive integer $N = N(k)$ set*

$$H = \left\lfloor \frac{\log \log y_1}{\log \rho} - L_k \right\rfloor \quad \text{and} \quad B = H - N + 1.$$

If N is large enough, then

$$H^{(k+1)}(x, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y}) \gg_{k, \delta, c} \frac{x}{(\log y_1)^{k+1}} (B(k+1) \log \rho)^B \text{Vol}(Y_B(N)),$$

where $Y_B(N)$ is the set of $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_B) \in \mathbb{R}^B$ satisfying

- (1) $0 \leq \xi_1 \leq \dots \leq \xi_B \leq 1$;
- (2) $\xi_{i+1} \geq i/B$ ($1 \leq i \leq B-1$);
- (3) $\sum_{j=1}^B \lambda^{j-B\xi_j} \leq \lambda^N$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{B}^*$ be the set of vectors $(b_1, \dots, b_H) \in (\mathbb{N} \cup \{0\})^H$ such that $b_i = 0$ for $i < N$,

$$(3.22) \quad B_i \leq i - N + 1 \quad (N \leq i \leq H)$$

and

$$(3.23) \quad \sum_{m=N}^H \lambda^{B_m - m} \leq \frac{\lambda + \lambda^{-N}}{1 - 1/\lambda}.$$

Lemma 3.4 and the definition of H imply that $\log \lambda_H \leq \rho^{H+L_k} \leq \log y_1$. Hence

$$(3.24) \quad \bigcup_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{B}^*} \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{b}) \subset \{a \in \mathbb{N} : P^+(a) \leq y_1, \mu^2(a) = 1\}.$$

Fix for the moment $\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{B}^* \subset \mathcal{B}$. By Lemma 3.8 and relation (3.23) we have that

$$(3.25) \quad \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{b})} \frac{W_{k+1}^P(a)}{a} \ll_k \frac{((k+1) \log \rho)^B}{b_N! \dots b_H!} \left(1 + \sum_{m=N}^H \lambda^{B_m - m} \right) \ll_k \frac{((k+1) \log \rho)^B}{b_N! \dots b_H!}.$$

Also, if N is large enough, then Lemma 3.4 and relation (3.22) imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{b})} \frac{\tau_{k+1}(a)}{a} &= (k+1)^B \prod_{j=N}^H \frac{1}{b_j!} \left(\sum_{p_1 \in D_j} \frac{1}{p_1} \sum_{\substack{p_2 \in D_j \\ p_2 \neq p_1}} \frac{1}{p_2} \cdots \sum_{\substack{p_{b_j} \in D_j \\ p_{b_j} \notin \{p_1, \dots, p_{b_j-1}\}}} \frac{1}{p_{b_j}} \right) \\
 &\geq \frac{(k+1)^B}{b_N! \cdots b_H!} \prod_{j=N}^H \left(\log \rho - \frac{b_j}{\lambda_{j-1}} \right)^{b_j} \\
 &\geq \frac{((k+1) \log \rho)^B}{b_N! \cdots b_H!} \prod_{j=N}^H \left(1 - \frac{j - N + 1}{(\log \rho) \exp\{\rho^{j-L_k-1}\}} \right)^{j-N+1} \\
 &\geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{((k+1) \log \rho)^B}{b_N! \cdots b_H!}
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

as well as

$$\frac{\phi(a)}{a} \geq \prod_{j=N}^H \left(1 - \frac{1}{\lambda_{j-1}} \right)^{b_j} \geq \prod_{j=N}^H \left(1 - \frac{1}{\exp\{\rho^{j-L_k-1}\}} \right)^{j-N+1} \geq \frac{1}{2} \tag{3.27}$$

for $a \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{b})$. Combining Lemma 3.3 with relations (3.25) and (3.26) we deduce that

$$\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{b})} \frac{L^{(k+1)}(a)}{a} \gg_k \frac{((k+1) \log \rho)^B}{b_N! \cdots b_H!}.$$

The above relation together with (3.24), (3.27) and Lemma 3.2 yields that

$$\tilde{H}^{(k+1)}(x, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y}) \gg_{k, \delta, c} x \frac{((k+1) \log \rho)^B}{(\log y_1)^{k+1}} \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{B}^*} \frac{1}{b_N! \cdots b_H!}.$$

For $i \in \{1, \dots, B\}$ set $g_i = b_{N-1+i}$ and let $G_i = g_1 + \cdots + g_i$. Then

$$G_i = B_{i+N-1} \leq i \quad (1 \leq i \leq B) \tag{3.28}$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^B \lambda^{G_i-i} = \lambda^{N-1} \sum_{m=N}^H \lambda^{B_m-m} \leq \frac{\lambda^N + 1/\lambda}{1 - 1/\lambda}, \tag{3.29}$$

by (3.22) and (3.23), respectively. With this notation we have that

$$\tilde{H}^{(k+1)}(x, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y}) \gg_{k, \delta, c} x \frac{((k+1) \log \rho)^B}{(\log y_1)^{k+1}} \sum_{\mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{G}} \frac{1}{g_1! \cdots g_B!}, \tag{3.30}$$

where $\mathcal{G}$ is the set of vectors $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_B)$ of non-negative integers $g_1, \dots, g_B$ with $g_1 + \cdots + g_B = B$ and such that (3.28) and (3.29) hold. For such a $\mathbf{g}$ let $R(\mathbf{g})$ be the set of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^B$ such that $0 \leq x_1 \leq \cdots \leq x_B \leq B$ and exactly g_i of the x_j 's lie in $[i-1, i)$ for each i . Then

$$\sum_{\mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{G}} \frac{1}{g_1! \cdots g_B!} = \sum_{\mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{G}} \text{Vol}(R(\mathbf{g})) = \text{Vol}(\cup_{\mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{G}} R(\mathbf{g})). \tag{3.31}$$

We claim that

$$(3.32) \quad \text{Vol}(\cup_{\mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{G}} R(\mathbf{g})) \geq B^B \text{Vol}(Y_B(N)).$$

Take $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in Y_B(N)$ with $\xi_B < 1$ and set $x_j = B\xi_j$. Let g_i be the number of x_j 's lying in $[i-1, i)$. It suffices to show that $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_B) \in \mathcal{G}$. Condition (2) in the definition of $Y_B(N)$ implies that

$$x_{i+1} \geq i \quad (1 \leq i \leq B-1),$$

which yields (3.28). Finally, condition (3) in the definition of $Y_B(N)$ gives us that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\lambda^N}{1-1/\lambda} &\geq \frac{1}{1-1/\lambda} \sum_{j=1}^B \lambda^{j-x_j} \geq \frac{1}{1-1/\lambda} \sum_{i=1}^B \lambda^{-i} \sum_{j: x_j \in [i-1, i)} \lambda^j \geq \sum_{i=1}^B \sum_{m=i}^B \lambda^{-m} \sum_{j: x_j \in [i-1, i)} \lambda^j \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^B \lambda^{-m} \sum_{j: x_j < m} \lambda^j \geq \sum_{\substack{1 \leq m \leq B \\ G_m > 0}} \lambda^{-m+G_m} \geq -\frac{1}{\lambda-1} + \sum_{m=1}^B \lambda^{-m+G_m}, \end{aligned}$$

that is (3.29) holds. To conclude, we have showed that $\mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{G}$, which proves that inequality (3.32) does hold. This fact along with (3.30) and (3.31) completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

Next, we give a lower bound to the volume of $Y_B(N)$.

Lemma 3.10. *Suppose that N is large enough. Then*

$$\text{Vol}(Y_B(N)) \gg \frac{1}{(B+1)!}.$$

The proof of the above lemma will be given in Section 5. If we use Lemmas 3.9 and 3.10, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}^{(k+1)}(x, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y}) &\gg_{k, \delta, c} \frac{x}{(\log y_1)^{k+1}} \frac{(B(k+1) \log \rho)^B}{B \cdot B!} \asymp \frac{x}{(\log y_1)^{k+1}} \frac{(e(k+1) \log \rho)^B}{B^{3/2}} \\ &\asymp_{k, \delta} \frac{x}{(\log y_1)^{Q(\frac{1}{\log \rho})} (\log \log y_1)^{3/2}}, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of Theorem 2 and thus the proof of the lower bound in Theorem 1.

4. UPPER BOUNDS.

The proof of the upper bound we will give follows the corresponding arguments in [5]. The argument is simplified slightly by Lemma 2.2. As in the proof of the lower bounds, we will assume that $y_1 > C_2$ for some large enough positive constant $C_2 = C_2(k, \delta)$; else, we may use the trivial bound $H^{(k+1)}(x, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y}) \leq x$ and immediately get the upper bound in Theorem 1.

For $\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and $x \geq 1$ define

$$H_*^{(k+1)}(x, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) = |\{n \leq x : \mu^2(n) = 1, \tau_{k+1}(n, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \geq 1\}|.$$

Also, for $t \geq 1$ set

$$S^{(k+1)}(t) = \sum_{\substack{P^+(a) \leq t \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{L^{(k+1)}(a)}{a}.$$

Then we have the following estimate.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $3 \leq y_1, \dots, y_k \leq x$ with $y_1 \cdots y_k \leq x/2^{k+1}$. Set $z_i = 2y_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$ and $z_{k+1} = \frac{x}{y_1 \cdots y_k}$. Then*

$$H_*^{(k+1)}(x, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y}) - H_*^{(k+1)}(x/2, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y}) \ll_k x(\log Z)^{k+1} \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \frac{S^{(k+1)}(z_i)}{(\log z_i)^{2k+2}},$$

where $Z = \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} z_j$.

Proof. Let $n \in (x/2, x]$ be a square-free integer such that $\tau_{k+1}(n, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y}) \geq 1$. Then we may write $n = d_1 \cdots d_{k+1}$ with $y_i < d_i \leq 2y_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Hence $d_{k+1} \in (\frac{x}{2^{k+1}y_1 \cdots y_k}, \frac{x}{y_1 \cdots y_k}]$. So if we set $y_{k+1} = \frac{x}{2^{k+1}y_1 \cdots y_k} \geq 1$, then $y_i < d_i \leq z_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, k+1$. For a unique permutation $\sigma \in S_{k+1}$ we have that $P^+(d_{\sigma(1)}) < \cdots < P^+(d_{\sigma(k+1)})$. Set $p_j = P^+(d_{\sigma(j)})$ for $j = 1, \dots, k+1$. Then we may write $n = aa'p_1 \cdots p_k b$, where $P^+(a) < p_1 < p_k < P^-(b)$ and all the prime divisors of a' lie in (p_1, p_k) . Observe that $d_{\sigma(1)} = p_1 d$ for some integer d with $P^+(d) < p_1$. In particular, $d|a$ and thus $y_{\sigma(1)} < d_{\sigma(1)} = p_1 d \leq p_1 a$. Consequently,

$$p_1 > Q = \max\left\{P^+(a), \frac{y_{\sigma(1)}}{a}\right\}.$$

Moreover,

$$P^+(a') \leq p_k = \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} P^+(d_{\sigma(j)}) \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} P^+(d_i) \leq Z,$$

by the choice of σ . In particular, $a' \in \mathcal{P}(Q, Z)$. Also, we have that $b > p_k$, since $p_{k+1}|b$ and $p_{k+1} > p_k$. Next, note that

$$(d_{\sigma(1)}/p_1) \cdots (d_{\sigma(k)}/p_k) | aa' \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{y_{\sigma(i)}}{p_i} < \frac{d_{\sigma(i)}}{p_i} \leq \frac{z_{\sigma(i)}}{p_i} \quad (1 \leq i \leq k).$$

So there are numbers $c_1, \dots, c_k \in \{1, 2, 2^2, \dots, 2^k\}$ such that

$$\mathbf{y}' := \left(\log \frac{c_1 y_{\sigma(1)}}{p_1}, \dots, \log \frac{c_k y_{\sigma(k)}}{p_k} \right) \in \mathcal{L}^{(k+1)}(aa').$$

Hence

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{aligned} & H_*^{(k+1)}(x, \mathbf{z}, 2\mathbf{z}) - H_*^{(k+1)}(x/2, \mathbf{z}, 2\mathbf{z}) \\ & \leq \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in S_{k+1} \\ c_1, \dots, c_k}} \sum_{\substack{P^+(a) \leq z_{\sigma(1)} \\ \mu^2(aa')=1}} \sum_{\substack{a' \in \mathcal{P}(Q, Z) \\ \mathbf{y}' \in \mathcal{L}^{(k+1)}(aa')}} \sum_{\substack{Q < p_1 < \cdots < p_k \\ p_k < b \leq x/(aa'p_1 \cdots p_k) \\ P^-(b) > p_k}} \sum_{\substack{1}} 1. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the innermost sum in the right hand side of (4.1) is

$$\ll \frac{x}{aa'p_1 \cdots p_k \log p_k} \ll \frac{x}{aa'p_1 \cdots p_k \log(2Q)},$$

by Lemma 2.1. Therefore (4.1) becomes

$$(4.2) \quad H_*^{(k+1)}(x, \mathbf{z}, 2\mathbf{z}) - H_*^{(k+1)}(x/2, \mathbf{z}, 2\mathbf{z}) \\ \ll x \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in S_{k+1} \\ c_1, \dots, c_k}} \sum_{P^+(a) \leq z_{\sigma(1)}} \sum_{\substack{a' \in \mathcal{P}(Q, Z) \\ \mu^2(aa')=1}} \frac{1}{aa' \log(2Q)} \sum_{\substack{Q < p_1 < \dots < p_k \\ \mathbf{y}' \in \mathcal{L}^{(k+1)}(aa')}} \frac{1}{p_1 \dots p_k}.$$

Fix a, a', σ and $c_1, \dots, c_k$ as above. Let $m_1 \dots m_k | aa'$ and set

$$I = [\log(m_1/2), \log m_1) \times \dots \times [\log(m_k/2), \log m_k)$$

as well as

$$U_i = \frac{c_i y_{\sigma(i)}}{2m_i} \quad (1 \leq i \leq k).$$

Then $\mathbf{y}' \in 3I = [\log(m_1/4), \log(2m_1)) \times \dots \times [\log(m_k/4), \log(2m_k))$ if, and only if, $U_i < p_i \leq 8U_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. Thus

$$(4.3) \quad \sum_{\substack{Q < p_1 < \dots < p_k \\ \mathbf{y}' \in 3I}} \frac{1}{p_1 \dots p_k} \leq \prod_{i=1}^k \sum_{\substack{U_i < p_i \leq 8U_i \\ p_i > Q}} \frac{1}{p_i} \ll_k \prod_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{\log(\max\{2Q, U_i\})} \leq \frac{1}{\log^k(2Q)}.$$

If $\{I_r\}_{r=1}^R$ is the collection of the cubes $[\log(m_1/2), \log m_1) \times \dots \times [\log(m_k/2), \log m_k)$ with $m_1 \dots m_k | aa'$, then Lemma 2.3 implies that there exists a sub-collection $\{I_{r_s}\}_{s=1}^S$ of mutually disjoint cubes such that

$$\mathcal{L}^{(k+1)}(aa') \subset \bigcup_{s=1}^S 3I_{r_s} \quad \text{and} \quad S(\log 2)^k = \text{Vol}\left(\bigcup_{s=1}^S I_{r_s}\right) \leq L^{(k+1)}(aa').$$

Thus (4.3) along with Lemma 3.1(b) yield that

$$\sum_{\substack{Q < p_1 < \dots < p_k \\ \mathbf{y}' \in \mathcal{L}^{(k+1)}(aa')}} \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 \dots p_k} \ll_k \frac{L^{(k+1)}(aa')}{\log^k(2Q)} \leq \frac{\tau_{k+1}(a') L^{(k+1)}(a)}{\log^k(2Q)}.$$

Inserting the above estimate into (4.2) we find that

$$H_*^{(k+1)}(x, \mathbf{z}, 2\mathbf{z}) - H_*^{(k+1)}(x/2, \mathbf{z}, 2\mathbf{z}) \\ \ll_k \sum_{\sigma \in S_{k+1}} \sum_{\substack{P^+(a) \leq z_{\sigma(1)} \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \sum_{\substack{a' \in \mathcal{P}(Q, Z) \\ \mu^2(a')=1}} \frac{\tau_{k+1}(a')}{a'} \frac{L^{(k+1)}(a)}{a \log^{k+1}(2Q)} \\ \ll_k (\log Z)^{k+1} \sum_{\sigma \in S_{k+1}} \sum_{\substack{a \leq P^+(z_{\sigma(1)}) \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{L^{(k+1)}(a)}{a \log^{2k+2}(P^+(a) + z_{\sigma(1)}/a)},$$

since

$$\sum_{\substack{a' \in \mathcal{P}(Q, Z) \\ \mu^2(a')=1}} \frac{\tau_{k+1}(a')}{a'} = \prod_{Q < p \leq Z} \left(1 + \frac{k+1}{p}\right) \ll_k \left(\frac{\log Z}{\log(2Q)}\right)^{k+1}.$$

To complete the proof use Lemma 2.2(c) to see that

$$\sum_{\substack{P^+(a) \leq t \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{L^{(k+1)}(a)}{a \log^{2k+2}(P^+(a) + t/a)} \ll_k \frac{S^{(k+1)}(t)}{(\log t)^{2k+2}} \quad (t \geq 2).$$

□

Next, we use the lemma we just proved to bound $H^{(k+1)}(x, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y})$ from above.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $k \geq 2$ and $0 < \delta \leq 1$. For $x \geq 3$ and $3 \leq y_1 \leq \dots \leq y_k$ with $2^{k+1}y_1 \dots y_k \leq x/y_1^\delta$ we have that*

$$H^{(k+1)}(x, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y}) \ll_{k,\delta} x \frac{(\log y_k)^{k+1}}{(\log y_1)^{2k+2}} S^{(k+1)}(y_1).$$

Proof. First, we reduce the problem to estimating $H_*^{(k+1)}(x, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y})$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\tau_{k+1}(n, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y}) \geq 1$. Write $n = n'n''$ with n' being square-free, n'' square-full and $(n', n'') = 1$. The number of $n \leq x$ with $n'' > (\log y_1)^{2k+2}$ is

$$\leq x \sum_{\substack{n'' \text{ square-full} \\ n'' > (\log y_1)^{2k+2}}} \frac{1}{n''} \ll \frac{x}{(\log y_1)^{k+1}}.$$

Assume now that $n'' \leq (\log y_1)^{2k+2}$. For some product $f_1 \dots f_k | n''$ there is a product $e_1 \dots e_k | n'$ such that $y_i/f_i < e_i \leq 2y_i/f_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Therefore

$$(4.4) \quad H^{(k+1)}(x, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y}) \leq \sum_{\substack{n'' \text{ square-full} \\ n'' \leq (\log y_1)^{2k+2}}} \sum_{f_1 \dots f_k | n''} H_*^{(k+1)}\left(\frac{x}{n''}, \left(\frac{y_1}{f_1}, \dots, \frac{y_k}{f_k}\right), 2\left(\frac{y_1}{f_1}, \dots, \frac{y_k}{f_k}\right)\right) + O\left(\frac{x}{(\log y_1)^{k+1}}\right).$$

Fix a square-full integer $n'' \leq (\log y_1)^{2k+2}$ and positive integers $f_1, \dots, f_k$ with $f_1 \dots f_k | n''$. Put $x' = x/n''$ and $y'_i = y_i/f_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Each $n' \in (x'/(\log y_1)^{k+1}, x']$ lies in a interval $(2^{-r-1}x', 2^{-r}x']$ for some integer $0 \leq r \leq \frac{k+1}{\log 2} \log_2 y_1$. We will apply Lemma 4.1 with $2^{-r}x'$ in place of x and $y'_1, \dots, y'_k$ in place of $y_1, \dots, y_k$. Set $z'_i = 2y'_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$ and $z'_{k+1} = 2^{-r}x'/(y'_1 \dots y'_k)$. Moreover, let $\mathbf{y}' = (y'_1, \dots, y'_k)$. Note that $\sqrt{y_1} \leq z'_j \leq 2y_k$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and

$$z'_{k+1} = \frac{x f_1 \dots f_k}{2^r n'' y_1 \dots y_k} \geq \frac{x}{(\log y_1)^{3k+3} y_1 \dots y_k} \geq y_1^{\delta/2},$$

provided that C_2 is large enough. So

$$\begin{aligned} H_*^{(k+1)}(x', \mathbf{y}', 2\mathbf{y}') &\ll_k \frac{x'}{(\log y_1)^{k+1}} + \sum_{0 \leq r \leq \frac{k+1}{\log 2} \log_2 y_1} \frac{x'}{2^r} \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} (\log y_k)^{k+1} \frac{S^{(k+1)}(z'_i)}{(\log z'_i)^{2k+2}} \\ &\ll_{k,\delta} \frac{x'}{(\log y_1)^{k+1}} + x' (\log y_k)^{k+1} \max \left\{ \frac{S^{(k+1)}(t)}{(\log t)^{2k+2}} : t \geq y_1^{\delta/2} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By the above estimate, (4.4) and the straightforward inequalities

$$\sum_{n'' \text{ square-full}} \frac{\tau_{k+1}(n'')}{n''} \ll_k 1$$

and $S^{(k+1)}(t) \geq L^{(k+1)}(1) = (\log 2)^k$, we deduce that

$$H^{(k+1)}(x, \mathbf{y}, 2\mathbf{y}) \ll_{k,\delta} x(\log y_k)^{k+1} \max \left\{ \frac{S^{(k+1)}(t)}{(\log t)^{2k+2}} : t \geq y_1^{\delta/2} \right\}.$$

Finally, note that for every $t \geq y_1^{\delta/2}$ we have that

$$S^{(k+1)}(t) \leq \sum_{\substack{P^+(a_1) \leq y_1^{\delta/2} \\ \mu^2(a_1)=1}} \frac{L^{(k+1)}(a_1)}{a_1} \sum_{\substack{a_2 \in \mathcal{P}(y_1^{\delta/2}, t) \\ \mu^2(a_2)=1}} \frac{\tau_{k+1}(a_2)}{a_2} \ll_{k,\delta} \left(\frac{\log t}{\log y_1} \right)^{k+1} \sum_{\substack{P^+(a_1) \leq y_1 \\ \mu^2(a_1)=1}} \frac{L^{(k+1)}(a_1)}{a_1},$$

where we used Lemma 3.1(b). Therefore

$$\frac{S^{(k+1)}(t)}{(\log t)^{2k+2}} \ll_k \frac{S^{(k+1)}(y_1)}{(\log y_1 \log t)^{k+1}} \ll_{k,\delta} \frac{S^{(k+1)}(y_1)}{(\log y_1)^{2k+2}},$$

which completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

We proceed by bounding $S^{(k+1)}(y_1)$ from above. First, define

$$\omega_k(a) = |\{p|a : p > k\}|$$

and

$$S_r^{(k+1)}(y_1) = \sum_{\substack{P^+(a) \leq y_1 \\ \omega_k(a)=r, \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{L^{(k+1)}(a)}{a}.$$

Then we have the following estimate of $S_r^{(k+1)}(y_1)$ when $1 \leq r \ll_k \log \log y_1$.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $v = \lfloor \frac{\log \log y_1}{\log \rho} \rfloor$ and assume that $1 \leq r \leq (10k)v$. Then*

$$S_r^{(k+1)}(y_1) \ll_k ((k+1) \log \log y_1)^r U_r(v; k),$$

where

$$U_r(v; k) = \int \cdots \int \left(\min_{0 \leq j \leq r} \rho^{-j} (\rho^{v\xi_1} + \cdots + \rho^{v\xi_j} + 1) \right)^k d\boldsymbol{\xi}.$$

Proof. For the sets D_j constructed in Section 3 we have that

$$\{p \text{ prime} : k < p \leq y_1\} \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{v+L_k+1} D_j,$$

by Lemma 3.4. Consider a square-free integer $a = bp_1 \cdots p_r$ with $P^+(b) \leq k < p_1 < \cdots < p_r$ and define j_i by $p_i \in D_{j_i}$, $1 \leq i \leq r$. By Lemmas 3.1 and 3.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} L^{(k+1)}(a) &\leq \tau_{k+1}(b) L^{(k+1)}(p_1 \cdots p_r) \\ &\leq \tau_{k+1}(b) \min_{0 \leq s \leq r} (k+1)^{r-s} (\log p_1 + \cdots + \log p_s + \log 2)^k \\ &\ll_k \tau_{k+1}(b) (k+1)^r F(\mathbf{j}), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$F(\mathbf{j}) := \left(\min_{0 \leq s \leq r} \rho^{-s} (\rho^{j_1} + \cdots + \rho^{j_s} + 1) \right)^k.$$

Furthermore, we have that

$$\sum_{\substack{P^+(b) \leq k \\ \mu^2(b)=1}} \frac{\tau_{k+1}(b)}{b} \ll_k 1.$$

So if $\mathcal{J}$ denotes the set of vectors $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_r)$ satisfying $1 \leq j_1 \leq \cdots \leq j_r \leq v + L_k + 1$, then

$$(4.5) \quad S_r^{(k+1)}(y_1) \ll_k (k+1)^r \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{J}} F(\mathbf{j}) \sum_{\substack{p_1 < \cdots < p_r \\ p_i \in D_{j_i} \ (1 \leq i \leq r)}} \frac{1}{p_1 \cdots p_r}.$$

Fix $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_r) \in \mathcal{J}$ and let $b_s = |\{1 \leq i \leq r : j_i = s\}|$ for $1 \leq s \leq v + L_k + 1$. By (3.6) and the hypothesis that $r \leq 10kv$, the sum over $p_1, \dots, p_r$ in (4.5) is at most

$$\begin{aligned} (4.6) \quad \prod_{s=1}^{v+L_k+1} \frac{1}{b_s!} \left(\sum_{p \in D_s} \frac{1}{p} \right)^{b_s} &\leq \frac{(\log \rho)^r}{b_1! \cdots b_{v+L_k+1}!} = ((v + L_k + 1) \log \rho)^r \text{Vol}(I(\mathbf{j})) \\ &\ll_k (\log \log y_1)^r \text{Vol}(I(\mathbf{j})), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$I(\mathbf{j}) := \{0 \leq \xi_1 \leq \cdots \leq \xi_r \leq 1 : j_i - 1 \leq (v + L_k + 1)\xi_i < j_i \ (1 \leq i \leq r)\},$$

because for each $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) \in I(\mathbf{j})$ and $s \in \{1, \dots, v + L_k + 1\}$ there are exactly b_s numbers ξ_j satisfying $s - 1 \leq (v + L_k + 1)\xi_i < s$ and $\text{Vol}(\{0 \leq x_1 \leq \cdots \leq x_b \leq 1\}) = 1/b!$. Inserting (4.6) into (4.5) we deduce that

$$S_r^{(k+1)}(y_1) \ll_k ((k+1) \log \log y_1)^r \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{J}} F(\mathbf{j}) \text{Vol}(I(\mathbf{j})).$$

Finally, note that for every $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in I(\mathbf{j})$ we have that $\rho^{j_i} \leq \rho^{1+(v+L_k+1)\xi_i} \leq \rho^{L_k+2} \rho^{v\xi_i}$ and thus

$$F(\mathbf{j}) \ll_k \left(\min_{0 \leq g \leq r} \rho^{-g} (\rho^{v\xi_1} + \cdots + \rho^{v\xi_g} + 1) \right)^k,$$

which in turn implies that

$$\sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{J}} F(\mathbf{j}) \text{Vol}(I(\mathbf{j})) \ll_k U_r(v; k).$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

The proof of the next lemma will be given in section 5.

Lemma 4.4. *Suppose r, v are integers satisfying $1 \leq r \leq (10k)v$. Then*

$$U_r(v; k) \ll_k \frac{1 + |v - r|}{(r + 1)!((k + 1)^{r-v} + 1)}.$$

We combine Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4 to estimate $S^{(k+1)}(y_1)$.

Lemma 4.5. *We have that*

$$S^{(k+1)}(y_1) \ll_k \frac{(\log y_1)^{k+1-Q(\frac{1}{\log \rho})}}{(\log \log y_1)^{3/2}}.$$

Proof. Let $v = \lfloor \frac{\log \log y_1}{\log \rho} \rfloor$. By Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4 we have that

$$(4.7) \quad \sum_{v < r \leq 10kv} S_r^{(k+1)}(y_1) \ll_k \sum_{v < r \leq 10kv} \frac{(r - v)}{(k + 1)^{r-v}} \frac{((k + 1) \log \log y_1)^r}{(r + 1)!} \ll_k \frac{((k + 1) \log \log y_1)^v}{(v + 1)!},$$

since $\log \rho < 1$, and

$$(4.8) \quad \sum_{1 \leq r \leq v} S_r^{(k+1)}(y_1) \ll_k \sum_{1 \leq r \leq v} (1 + v - r) \frac{((k + 1) \log \log y_1)^r}{(r + 1)!} \ll_k \frac{((k + 1) \log \log y_1)^v}{(v + 1)!},$$

since $(k + 1) \log \rho > 1$. It remains to estimate the sum of $S_r^{(k+1)}(y_1)$ over $r > 10kv$. Let $r > 10kv$ and $a \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $\mu^2(a) = 1$ and $\omega_k(a) = r$. Then we may uniquely write $a = a_1 a_2$ with $P^+(a_1) \leq k < P^-(a_2)$, in which case $\omega(a_2) = r$. Applying Lemma 3.1(a) we find that

$$L^{(k+1)}(a) \leq (\log 2)^k \tau_{k+1}(a) = (\log 2)^k \tau_{k+1}(a_1)(k + 1)^r.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{r > 10kv} S_r^{(k+1)}(y_1) &\leq (\log 2)^k \sum_{r > 10kv} \sum_{\substack{P^+(a_1) \leq k \\ \mu^2(a_1) = 1}} \sum_{\substack{a_2 \in \mathcal{P}(k, y_1) \\ \omega(a_2) = r, \mu^2(a_2) = 1}} \frac{\tau_{k+1}(a_1)(k + 1)^r}{a_1 a_2} \\ &\ll_k \sum_{r > 10kv} (k + 1)^r \sum_{\substack{a_2 \in \mathcal{P}(k, y_1) \\ \omega(a_2) = r, \mu^2(a_2) = 1}} \frac{1}{a_2} \leq \sum_{r > 10kv} \frac{(k + 1)^r}{r!} \left(\sum_{k < p \leq y_1} \frac{1}{p} \right)^r. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\sum_{k < p \leq y_1} \frac{1}{p} = \log \log y_1 + O_k(1),$$

we deduce that

$$(4.9) \quad \sum_{r > 10kv} S_r^{(k+1)}(y_1) \ll_k \frac{((k + 1) \log \log y_1 + O_k(1))^{10kv}}{(10kv)!} \ll_k \frac{((k + 1) \log \log y_1)^v}{(v + 1)!}.$$

Combining relations (4.7), (4.8) and (4.9) we get that

$$S^{(k+1)}(y_1) \ll_k S_0^{(k+1)}(y_1) + \frac{((k + 1) \log \log y_1)^v}{(v + 1)!} \ll_k 1 + \frac{((k + 1) \log \log y_1)^v}{(v + 1)!}.$$

Thus an application of Stirling's formula completes the proof. $\square$

Finally, insert the estimate of Lemma 4.5 into Lemma 4.2 to finish the proof of the upper bound in Theorem 1.

5. ESTIMATES FROM ORDER STATISTICS

The following discussion is a generalization of estimates about uniform order statistics obtained in [5] in order to fit this context. Our ultimate goal is to give a proof of Lemmas 3.10 and 4.4. Set

$$S_r(u, v) = \left\{ (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) \in \mathbb{R}^r : 0 \leq \xi_1 \leq \dots \leq \xi_r \leq 1, \xi_i \geq \frac{i-u}{v} \ (1 \leq i \leq r) \right\}$$

and

$$Q_r(u, v) = \mathbf{Prob} \left(\xi_i \geq \frac{i-u}{v} \ (1 \leq i \leq k) \mid 0 \leq \xi_1 \leq \dots \leq \xi_r \leq 1 \right) = r! \text{Vol}(S_r(u, v)).$$

Combining Theorem 1 in [7] and Lemma 11.1 in [6] we have the following result.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $w = u + v - r$. Uniformly in $u > 0$, $w > 0$ and $r \geq 1$, we have*

$$Q_r(u, v) \ll \frac{(u+1)(w+1)}{r}.$$

Furthermore, if $1 \leq u \leq r$, then

$$Q_r(u, r+1-u) \geq \frac{u-1/2}{r+1/2}.$$

Also, we need Lemma 4.3 from [5], which we state below. Note that we have replaced the constant “10” with a general constant C , $(u+v-r)^2$ by $u+v-r$ and $(g-2)!$ by $(g-1)!$, which is allowed because we are using Lemma 5.1 in place of Lemma 4.1 in [5]. The proof remains exactly the same.

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose $g, r, s, u, v \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfy*

$$2 \leq g \leq r/2, \ s \geq 0, \ r \leq Cv, \ u \geq 0, \ u+v \geq r+1,$$

where C is a constant > 1 . Let R be the subset of $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in S_r(u, v)$ such that, for some $l \geq g+1$, we have

$$\frac{l-u}{v} \leq \xi_l \leq \frac{l-u+1}{v}, \quad \xi_{l-g} \geq \frac{l-u-s}{v}.$$

Then

$$\text{Vol}(R) \ll_C \frac{(C(s+1))^g (u+1)(u+v-r)}{(g-1)! (r+1)!}.$$

We now prove Lemma 3.10.

Proof of Lemma 3.10. For $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_B) \in \mathbb{R}^B$ set

$$F_B(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \sum_{j=1}^B \lambda^{j-B\xi_j}.$$

Note that

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Vol}(Y_B(N)) &= \text{Vol}(S_B(1, B)) - \text{Vol}(\{\boldsymbol{\xi} \in S_B(1, B) : F_B(\boldsymbol{\xi}) > \lambda^N\}) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{(2B+1)B!} - \frac{1}{\lambda^N} \int_{S_B(1, B)} F_B(\boldsymbol{\xi}) d\boldsymbol{\xi}, \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 5.1. In [6, Lemma 4.9, p. 423-424] it is shown that

$$\int_{S_r(u, v)} \sum_{j=1}^r 2^{j-v\xi_j} d\boldsymbol{\xi} \ll \frac{2^u u}{(r+1)!},$$

provided that $u + v = r + 1$, $1 \leq v \leq r \leq 100(v-1)$ and r is large enough. Following the same argument we have

$$(5.2) \quad \int_{S_B(1, B)} F_B(\boldsymbol{\xi}) d\boldsymbol{\xi} \ll_k \frac{1}{(B+1)!}$$

(the only thing we need to check is that $\lambda > 1$ so that the integral $\int_0^\infty (y+1)^3 \lambda^{-y} dy$ converges). By (5.1) and (5.2) we deduce that

$$\text{Vol}(Y_B(N)) \geq \frac{1}{(2B+1)B!} - O_k\left(\frac{\lambda^{-N}}{(B+1)!}\right) \gg \frac{1}{(B+1)!},$$

provided that $N = N(k)$ is large enough. This completes the proof. $\square$

Finally, we show Lemma 4.4. Before we get to this proof we need a preliminary result. For $\mu > 1$ define

$$\mathcal{T}_\mu(r, v, \gamma) = \{0 \leq \xi_1 \leq \dots \leq \xi_r \leq 1 : \mu^{v\xi_1} + \dots + \mu^{v\xi_j} \geq \mu^{j-\gamma} \ (1 \leq j \leq r)\}.$$

Then we have the following estimate.

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose r, v, γ are integers with $\gamma \geq 0$ and $1 \leq r \leq Cv$, where $C > 1$ is a constant. Set $b = r - v$ and*

$$Y = \begin{cases} b & \text{if } b \geq \gamma + 1, \\ (\gamma - b + 1)(\gamma + 1) & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Then

$$\text{Vol}(\mathcal{T}_\mu(r, v, \gamma)) \ll_{C, \mu} \frac{Y}{\mu^{\mu^{b-\gamma}} (r+1)!}.$$

Proof. Set $t = \max\{b - \gamma, 2 + \frac{\log 32}{\log \mu}\}$. For every $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathcal{T}_\mu(r, v, \gamma)$ we have that either

$$(5.3) \quad \xi_j > \frac{j - \gamma - t}{v} \quad (1 \leq j \leq r)$$

or there are integers $h \geq t + 1$ and $1 \leq l \leq r$ such that

$$(5.4) \quad \min_{1 \leq j \leq r} \left(\xi_j - \frac{j - \gamma}{v} \right) = \xi_l - \frac{l - \gamma}{v} \in \left[\frac{-h}{v}, \frac{-h+1}{v} \right].$$

Let V_1 be the volume of $\xi \in \mathcal{T}_\mu(r, v, \gamma)$ that satisfy (5.3) and let V_2 be the volume of $\xi \in \mathcal{T}_\mu(r, v, \gamma)$ that satisfy (5.4) for some integers $h \geq t+1$ and $1 \leq l \leq r$. First, we bound V_1 . If $b \geq \gamma + 2 + \log 32 / \log \mu$ so that $t = b - \gamma$, then (5.3) is not possible because it would imply that $\xi_r > 1$. So assume that $b < \gamma + 2 + \log 32 / \log \mu$, in which case $t = 2 + \log 32 / \log \mu$. Then

$$V_1 \leq \frac{Q_r(\gamma + 2 + \frac{\log 32}{\log \mu}, v)}{r!} \ll \frac{(\gamma + 3 + \frac{\log 32}{\log \mu})(\gamma + 3 + \frac{\log 32}{\log \mu} - b)}{(r+1)!} \ll_\mu \frac{Y}{\mu^{\mu^{b-\gamma}}(r+1)!},$$

by Lemma 5.1. Finally, we bound V_2 . Fix $h \geq t+1$ and $1 \leq l \leq r$ and consider $\xi \in \mathcal{T}_\mu(r, v, \gamma)$ that satisfies (5.4). Then

$$-\frac{l-\gamma}{v} \leq \xi_l - \frac{l-\gamma}{v} \leq \frac{-h+1}{v}$$

and consequently

$$l \geq \gamma + h - 1 \geq \gamma + t > 2.$$

Set

$$(5.5) \quad h_0 = h - 1 - \left\lceil \frac{\log 4}{\log \mu} \right\rceil \geq t - \left(\frac{\log 4}{\log \mu} + 1 \right) \geq 1 + \frac{\log 8}{\log \mu}.$$

We claim that there exists some $m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $m \geq h_0$ and $\lfloor \mu^m \rfloor < l/2$ such that

$$(5.6) \quad \xi_{l-\lfloor \mu^m \rfloor} \geq \frac{l-\gamma-2m}{v}.$$

Indeed, note that

$$(5.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \mu^{v\xi_1} + \dots + \mu^{v\xi_l} &\leq 2 \sum_{l/2 < j \leq l} \mu^{v\xi_j} \leq 2 \left(\mu^{v\xi_l} + \sum_{\substack{m \geq 0 \\ \lfloor \mu^m \rfloor < l/2}} \sum_{\lfloor \mu^m \rfloor \leq j < \lfloor \mu^{m+1} \rfloor} \mu^{v\xi_{l-j}} \right) \\ &\leq 2 \left(\mu^{h_0} \mu^{v\xi_l} + \sum_{\substack{m \geq h_0 \\ \lfloor \mu^m \rfloor < l/2}} (\lfloor \mu^{m+1} \rfloor - \lfloor \mu^m \rfloor) \mu^{v\xi_{l-\lfloor \mu^m \rfloor}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

So if (5.6) failed for all $m \geq h_0$ with $\lfloor \mu^m \rfloor < l/2$, then (5.4) and (5.7) would imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^{v\xi_1} + \dots + \mu^{v\xi_l} &< 2 \left(\mu^{h_0} \mu^{l-\gamma-h+1} + \sum_{m \geq h_0} (\lfloor \mu^{m+1} \rfloor - \lfloor \mu^m \rfloor) \mu^{l-\gamma-2m} \right) \\ &= 2\mu^{l-\gamma} \left(\mu^{-\lceil \frac{\log 4}{\log \mu} \rceil} + (\mu^2 - 1) \sum_{m \geq h_0+1} \lfloor \mu^m \rfloor \mu^{-2m} - \lfloor \mu^{h_0} \rfloor \mu^{-2h_0} \right) \\ &\leq 2\mu^{l-\gamma} \left(\frac{1}{4} + \frac{\mu^{h_0+1} + 1}{\mu^{2h_0}} \right) \leq 2\mu^{l-\gamma} \left(\frac{1}{4} + \frac{2}{\mu^{h_0-1}} \right) \leq \mu^{l-\gamma}, \end{aligned}$$

by (5.5), which is a contradiction. Hence (5.6) does hold and Lemma 5.2 applied with $u = \gamma + h$, $g = \lfloor \mu^m \rfloor$ and $s = 2m$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} V_2 &\ll_C \sum_{h \geq t+1} \sum_{m \geq h_0} \frac{(\gamma + h + 1)(\gamma + h - b)}{(r + 1)!} \frac{(C(2m + 1))^{\lfloor \mu^m \rfloor}}{(\lfloor \mu^m \rfloor - 1)!} \\ &\ll_{C, \mu} \sum_{h \geq t+1} \sum_{m \geq h_0} \frac{(\gamma + h + 1)(\gamma + h - b)}{(r + 1)!} \left(\frac{Ce(2m + 1)}{\mu^m} \right)^{\mu^m} \mu^{2m} \\ &\ll_{C, \mu} \sum_{h \geq t+1} \sum_{m \geq h_0} \frac{(\gamma + h + 1)(\gamma + h - b)}{\mu^{\mu^{m+m_0}} (r + 1)!}, \end{aligned}$$

where $m_0 = 1 + \lceil \log 4 / \log \mu \rceil$. The sum of $\mu^{-\mu^{m+m_0}}$ over $m \geq h_0$ is $\ll_{\mu} \mu^{-\mu^h}$. Finally, summing over $h \geq t + 1$ gives us that

$$V_2 \ll_{C, \mu} \frac{(\gamma + t + 2)(\gamma - b + t + 1)}{\mu^{\mu^{t+1}} (r + 1)!} \ll_{C, \mu} \frac{Y}{\mu^{\mu^{b-\gamma}} (r + 1)!},$$

which completes the proof. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 4.4. Recall that $\rho = (k + 1)^{1/k}$. Set

$$F(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \left(\min_{0 \leq j \leq r} \rho^{-j} (\rho^{v\xi_1} + \dots + \rho^{v\xi_j} + 1) \right)^k$$

and note that $F(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \leq 1$. Fix an integer $m \geq 1$. Consider $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^r$ with $0 \leq \xi_1 \leq \dots \leq \xi_r \leq 1$ such that $2^k(k + 1)^{-m} \leq F(\boldsymbol{\xi}) < 2^k(k + 1)^{1-m}$. For $1 \leq j \leq r$ we have that

$$\rho^{-j} (\rho^{v\xi_1} + \dots + \rho^{v\xi_j}) \geq \rho^{-j}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{-j} (\rho^{v\xi_1} + \dots + \rho^{v\xi_j}) &= \rho^{-j} (\rho^{v\xi_1} + \dots + \rho^{v\xi_j} + 1) - \rho^{-j} \\ &\geq (F(\boldsymbol{\xi}))^{1/k} - \rho^{-j} \geq 2\rho^{-m} - \rho^{-j}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\rho^{-j} (\rho^{v\xi_1} + \dots + \rho^{v\xi_j}) \geq \max\{\rho^{-j}, 2\rho^{-m} - \rho^{-j}\} \geq \rho^{-m},$$

that is $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathcal{T}_{\rho}(r, v, m)$. Therefore Lemma 5.3 applied with $C = 10k$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} (5.8) \quad U_r(v; k) &\leq \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} 2^k(k + 1)^{1-m} \text{Vol}(\mathcal{T}_{\rho}(r, v, m)) \\ &\ll_k \frac{1}{(r + 1)!} \left(\sum_{1 \leq m \leq b} \frac{b}{(k + 1)^m \rho^{b-m}} + \sum_{m \geq \max\{1, b\}} \frac{m(m - b + 1)}{(k + 1)^m} \right). \end{aligned}$$

If $b \geq 1$, then each sum in the right hand side of (5.8) is $\ll_k b(k + 1)^{-b}$. On the other hand, if $b \leq 0$, then the first sum is empty and the second one is $\ll_k 1 + |b|$. In any case,

$$U_r(v; k) \ll_k \frac{1}{(r + 1)!} \frac{1 + |b|}{(k + 1)^b + 1},$$

which completes the proof. $\square$

REFERENCES

1. H. Davenport, *Multiplicative Number Theory*, third. ed., Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 74, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000, Revised and with a preface by Hugh L. Montgomery.
2. P. Erdős, *Some remarks on number theory*, Riveon Lematematika **9** (1955), 45-48, (Hebrew. English summary).
3. P. Erdős, *An asymptotic inequality in the theory of numbers*, Vestnik Leningrad Univ. **15** (1960), no. 13, 41-49, (Russian).
4. G. B. Folland, *Real Analysis. Modern Techniques and Applications* Second edition. John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1999.
5. K. Ford, *Integers with a divisor in $(y, 2y]$* , Anatomy of integers (Jean-Marie Koninck, Andrew Granville, and Florian Luca, eds.) CRM Proc. and Lect. Notes 46, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2008, 65-81.
6. K. Ford, *The distribution of integers with a divisor in a given interval*, Annals of Math. (2) **168** (2008), 367-433.
7. K. Ford, *Sharp probability estimates for generalized Smirnov statistics*, Monatshefte Math. **153** (2008), 205-216.
8. K. Ford, *Generalized Smirnov statistics and the distribution of prime factors*, Funct. Approx. Comment. Math. **37** (2007), part 1, 119-129.
9. H. Halberstam and H.-E. Richert, *Sieve methods*, Academic Press [A subsidiary of Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], London-New York, 1974, London Mathematical Society Monographs, No. 4.
10. R. R. Hall and G. Tenenbaum, *Divisors*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 90, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2008.
11. A. K. Haynes and K. Homma, *The group ring $\mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$ and an application of a divisor problem*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **137** (2009), 1285-1293.
12. G. Tenenbaum, *Sur la probabilité qu'un entier possède un diviseur dans un intervalle donné*, Compositio Math. **51** (1984), 243-263.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN, 1409 WEST GREEN STREET, URBANA, IL 61801, U.S.A.

E-mail address: dkoukou2@math.uiuc.edu